BS2555
.C187
1824
v.4

Theological Seminary.
PRINCETON, N. J.
Part of the
ADDISON ALEXANDER LIBRARY,
which was presented by
Messrs. R. L. and A. Stuart.

Case,
Shelf,
Book,
Division
Section
No.

THE

FOUR GOSPELS,

TRANSLATED FROM THE GREEK.

WITH

PRELIMINARY DISSERTATIONS,

AND

NOTES CRITICAL AND EXPLANATORY.

BY GEORGE CAMPBELL, D.D. F.R.S. EDINBURGH.
Principal of the Marischal College, Aberdeen.

IN FOUR VOLUMES.

VOL. IV.

WITH THE AUTHOR'S LAST CORRECTIONS.

Μονη θυτεον τη Αληθεια.

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY T. BEDLINGTON, AND C. EWER.

1824.

BOSTON :
Printed by Munroe & Francis.

ADVERTISEMENT.

It is proper to observe that, in the following Notes, repetitions and unnecessary references are, as much as possible, avoided. When an useful illustration of any word or phrase is to be found in the Notes on one of the succeeding Gospels, the place is commonly referred to; not so, when it is in one of the preceding, because it may probably be remembered; and if it should not, the margin of the text will direct to the places proper to be consulted. But when the explanation of a term occurs in the Notes on a preceding Gospel, on a passage not marked in the margin as parallel, the place is mentioned in the Notes. In words which frequently recur, it has been judged convenient to adopt the following

ABBREVIATIONS.

Al.	Alexandrian manuscript	E. B.	English Bible——in common use
An.	Anonymous Eng. translation in 1729.	E. T.	English translation—the same
Ar.	Arias Montanus	Eng.	English
Ara.	Arabic	Er.	Erasmus
Arm.	Armenian	Eth.	Ethiopic
Be.	Beza	Euth.	Euthymius
Beau.	Beausobre and Lenfant	Fr.	French
Ben.	Bengelius	G. E.	Geneva English
Cal.	Calvin	G. F.	Geneva French
Cam.	Cambridge manuscript	Ger.	German
Cas.	Castalio	Go.	Gothic
Cha.	Chaldee	Gr.	Greek
Chr.	Chrysostom	Gro.	Grotius
Com.	Complutensian edition	Ham.	Hammond
Cop.	Coptic	Heb.	Hebrew
Dio.	Diodati	Hey.	Heylyn
Diss.	Dissertation	J.	John
Dod.	Doddridge		

Itc.	Italic	Sa.	Saci
Itn.	Italian	Sax.	Saxon
L.	Luke	Sc.	Scott
La.	Latin	Sep.	Septuagint
Lu.	Luther	Si.	Simon
L. Cl.	Le Clerc	Sy.	Syriac
M. G.	Modern Greek	The.	Theophylact
Mr.	Mark	Vat.	Vatican manuscript
MS.	Manuscript	Vul.	Vulgate
Mt.	Matthew	Wa.	Wakefield
N. T.	New Testament	Wes.	Wesley
O. T.	Old Testament	Wet.	Wetstein
P.	Part	Wh.	Whitby
P. R.	Port Royal translation	Wor.	Worsley
Per.	Persic	Wy.	Wynne
Pisc.	Piscator	Zu.	Zuric translation.
Rh.	Rhemish		

If there be a few more contractions not here specified, they are such only as are in pretty general use. In terms which occur seldomer, the words are given at length.

NOTES

CRITICAL AND EXPLANATORY.

THE GOSPEL BY MATTHEW.

THE TITLE.

THE title, neither of this, nor of the other, histories of our Lord, is to be ascribed to the penmen. But it is manifest, that the titles were prefixed in the earliest times, by those who knew the persons by whom, and the occasions on which, these writings were composed. For the sense wherein the word Gospel is here used, see Prel. Diss. V. P. II. § 18.

[2] *Κατα Ματθαιον, according to Matthew, of Matthew*, or *by Matthew.* These are synonymous, as has been evinced from the best authorities. Cas. rendered it *authore Matthæo*, properly enough. Nor is this, as Be. imagines, in the least repugnant to the claim of the Evangelists to inspiration. Paul does not hesitate to call the doctrine with which he was inspired *his Gospel.* Nor does any man at present scruple to call the Epistles written by that Apostle, *Paul's Epistles.*

[3] *Το κατα Ματθαιον ευαγγελιον.* I have preferred this to every other title, because it is not only the briefest and the simplest, but incomparably the oldest, and therefore the most respectable. All the ancient Gr. MSS. have it. The titles in the old La. version called Itc. were simply *Evangelium secundum Matthæum—secundum Marcum*, &c. and in the most ancient MSS. and even editions of the present Vulgate they are the same. From the writings of the Fathers, both Gr. and La. it appears that the title was retained every where in the same simplicity, as far down as the fifth century.

Afterwards, when, through a vitiated taste, useless epithets came much in vogue, some could not endure the nakedness of so simple a title. It then became *Sanctum Jesu Christi Evangelium secundum Matthæum, &c.* which is that used in the Vul. at present. The N. T. printed at Alcala (called the Complutensian Polyglot) is the first Gr. edition wherein a deviation was made, in this respect, from the primitive simplicity. The title is there in conformity to the Vulgate, printed along with it, *Το κατα Ματθαιον ἁγιον ευαγγελιον.* This mode was adopted by some subsequent editors. Most of the translators into modern languages have gone farther, and prefixed the same epithet to the name of the writer. Thus Dio. in Itn. *Il santo evangelio, &c. secondo S. Matteo.* The translators of P. R. Si. Sa. Beau. and L. Cl. in Fr. *Le sainte evangile, &c. selon Saint Matthieu.* Our translators after Lu. have not given the epithet to the Gospel, but have added it to the writer. Yet they have not prefixed this term to the names even of the Apostles in the titles of their Epistles. In this I think they are singular. The learned Wet. in his excellent edition of the Gr. N. T. remarks, that though the term corresponding to *Gospel* occurs in that book upwards of seventy times, it is not once accompanied with the epithet *holy.*

CHAPTER I.

1. *The lineage,* E. T. *The book of the generation. Βιβλος γενεσεως.* This phrase, which corresponds to the Heb. ספר תולדות *sepher tholdoth,* is supposed, by some, to be the title of the first seventeen verses only ; by others, of the whole book. The former in effect translate it as I have done ; the latter *The History.* That in the first of these senses, and also for an account of progeny, the Gr. phrase is use by Hellenist writers, is undeniable ; it is not so clear that it is used in the second, for a narrative of a man's life. It is true we sometimes find it where it can mean neither genealogy nor list of descendants, as in that phrase in the Sep. *Βιβλος γενεσεως ουρανου και γης,* Gen. ii. 4. the meaning of which is, doubtless, *the origin and gradual production of the universe,* which has plainly some analogy, though a remote one, to an account of ancestry. The quotations that have been produced on the other side, from the Pentateuch, Judith, and the Epistle of James, do not appear decisive of the question. Of still less weight is the name *Sepher toledoth Jesu,*

given to paltry, modern, Jewish fictions, written in opposition to the Gospel; though this also has been urged as an argument.

[2] *Christ*, *Χριστος*, without the article, is here to be understood, not as an appellative, as it is in almost all other places of the Gospel, but as a proper name. Into this use it came soon after our Lord's resurrection, but not before. Some distinction was necessary, as at that time the name *Jesus* was common among the Jews. Diss. V. P. IV. § 7.

[3] *Son*, *υἱον* indefinitely, not *τον υἱον the son* emphatically. The sense is rightly rendered by Cas. *prognati Davide*, a descendant of David. There is a modesty and simplicity in the manner in which the historian introduces his subject. He says no more than is necessary to make his readers distinguish the person of whom he speaks, leaving them to form their judgment of his mission and character, from a candid but unadorned narration of the facts.

2. *Judah*, &c. My reason for preferring the O. T. orthography of proper names you have Diss. XII. P. III. § 6, &c.

6. *By her who had been wife of Uriah.* *Εκ της του Ουριου.* Literally *By her of Uriah.* It is not just to say that the feminine article thus used denotes *the wife.* The relation is in this phrase neither expressed, nor necessarily implied, but is left to be supplied from the reader's knowledge of the subject. We have no idiom in English entirely similar. That which comes nearest is when we give the names, but suppress the relation, on account of its notoriety. Thus, if it were said, that David had Solomon *by Uriah's Bathsheba*, every body would be sensible that the expression does not necessarily imply that Bathsheba was *the wife*, more than *the widow*, *the daughter*, or even *the sister of Uriah.* We have an instance in Mark xvi.1. *Μαρια 'η του Ιακωβου* where the void must be supplied by the word *μητηρ mother.* The like holds of the masculine. In Acts i.13, *Ιακωβου Αλφαιου*, must be supplied by *υἱος*, *son*; and in Luke, vi. 16. *Ιουδαν Ιακωβου*, by *αδελφον*, *brother.* What therefore is really implied, in any particular case, can be learnt only from a previous acquaintance with the subject. Hence we discover that the ellipsis in this place cannot be supplied by the word *wife*; for when Uriah was dead, he could not be a husband. Those therefore who render *εκ της του Ουριου of Uriah's wife*, charge the historian with a blunder of which he is not guilty, and mislead careless readers into

the notion that Solomon was begotten in adultery. The common version exhibits the sense with sufficient exactness.

8. *Uzziah, τον Οξιαν.* So the Sep. renders this name in Gr. 2 Chr. xxvi. 3. Whereas *Ahaziah* is by them rendered *Οχοξιας.* Some names are omitted in the line, in whatever way it be rendered here; for though Ahaziah was indeed the son of Joram, Uzziah was the father of Jotham.

11. Some copies read, *Josiah begat Jehoiachin; Jehoiachin had Jeconiah,* &c. and this reading has been adopted into some editions. But there is no authority from ancient MSS. translations, or commentaries, for this reading, which seems to have sprung from some over-zealous transcriber, who, finding that there were only thirteen in either the second series or the third, has thought it necessary thus to supply the defect. For if Jehoiachin be reckoned in the second series, Jeconiah may be counted the first of the third, and then the whole will be complete. But as, in very early times, the Fathers found the same difficulty in this passage which we do at present, there is the greatest ground to suspect the correction above mentioned.

11, 12. *About the time of the migration into Babylon. After the migration into Babylon, επι της μετοικεσιας Βαξυλωνος. Μετα την μετοικεσιαν Βαξυλωνος.* In the La. versions, the word *μετοικεσια* is differently translated. The Vul. Arias, and Leo de Juda, render it *transmigratio,* Be. *transportatio,* Pisc. *deportatio,* Er. Cal. and Cas. *exilium,* Lu. in Ger. calls it **gefangniss,** Dio. in Itn. *cattivita,* Si. and L. Cl. in Fr. *transmigration.* G. F. P. R. Beau. and Sa. adopt a circumlocution, employing the verb *transporter.* The E. T. says, *about the time they were carried away to Babylon. After they were brought to Babylon.* In nearly the same way the words are rendered by Sc. Dod. renders them, *About the time of the Babylonish captivity. After the Babylonish captivity.* Wa. says, *the removal to Babylon.* It is evident, not only from the word employed by the sacred historian, but also from the context, that he points to the act of removing into Babylon, and not to the termination of the state wherein the people remained seventy years after their removal, as the event which concluded the second epoch, and began the third, mentioned in the 17th verse. Whereas the La. *exilium,* Ger. **gefangniss,** Itn. *cattivita,* and Eng. *cap-*

tivity, express the state of the people during all that period, and by consequence egregiously misrepresent the sense. They make the author say what is not true, that certain persons were begotten after, who were begotten during, the captivity. Further, it deserves to be remarked that, as this Apostle wrote, in the opinion of all antiquity, chiefly for the converts from Judaism, he carefully avoided giving any unnecessary offence to his countrymen. The terms *captivity*, *exile*, *transportation*, *subjection*, were offensive, and, with whatever truth they might be applied, the Jews could not easily bear the application. A remarkable instance of their delicacy in this respect, the effect of national pride, we have in J. viii. 33. where they boldly assert their uninterrupted freedom and independency, in contradiction both to their own historians, and to their own experience at that very time. This humour had led them to express some disagreeable events, which they could not altogether dissemble, by the softest names they could devise. Of this sort is *μετοικεσια*, by which they expressed the most dreadful calamity that had ever befallen their nation. The word strictly signifies no more than passing from one place or state to another. It does not even convey to the mind whether the change was voluntary or forced. For this reason we must admit that Be. Pisc. Beau. Sa. and the E. T. have all departed, though not so far as Cas. Lu. Dio. and Dod. from the more indefinite, and therefore more delicate expression of the original, and even from that of the Vul. from which Sa.'s version is professedly made. For the words used by all these imply compulsion. Nor let it be imagined that, because *μετοικεσια* occurs frequently in the Sep. where the word in the Heb. signifies *captivity*, it is therefore to be understood as equivalent. That version was made for the use of Grecian or Hellenist Jews, who lived in cities where Gr. was the vulgar tongue; and as the translation of the Scriptures into the language of the place, exposed their history to the natives, they were the more solicitous to soften, by a kind of euphemism, a circumstance so humiliating as their miserable enthralment to the Babylonians. For this reason, that event is, especially in the historical part, rarely denominated *αιχμαλωσια captivitas*, and never *διασπορη transportatio*, but by one or other of these gentler names, *μετοικια*, *μετοικεσια*, *αποικια*, and *αποικεσια*, *colonia*, *migratio*, *demigratio*, *incolatus*,

seu *habitatio in terra aliena*. On the whole, the Vul. Si. L. Cl. and Wa. have hit the import of the original more exactly than any of the other translators above mentioned. I did not think the term *transmigration* so proper in our language, that word being in a manner appropriated to the Oriental doctrine of the passage of the soul, after death, into another body. *Emigration* is at present, I imagine, more commonly used, when the removal is voluntary. The simple term *migration* seems fully to express the meaning of the original.

16. *Messiah*, *Χριστος*. For the import of the word, see Diss. V. P. IV. § 9.

18. *Jesus Christ*. The Vul. omits *Jesu*, and is followed only by the Per. and Sax. versions.

19. *Being a worthy man*, *δικαιος ων*. Some would have the word *δικαιος*, in this place, to signify *good-natured*, *humane*, *merciful*; because, to procure the infliction of the punishment denounced by the law, cannot be deemed *unjust*, without impeaching the law. Others think that it ought to be rendered, according to its usual signification, *just*; and imagine that it was the writer's intention to remark two qualities in Joseph's character; first, his strict *justice*, which would not permit him to live with an adulteress as his wife; secondly, his *humanity*, which led him to study privacy, in his method of dissolving the marriage. Herein, say they, there can be no injustice, because there are many things, both for compensation and punishment, which the law entitles, but does not oblige, a man to exact. Though this interpretation is specious, it is not satisfactory; for if the writer had intended to express two distinct qualities in Joseph's character, which drew him different ways, I think he would have expressed himself differently; as thus, *Though Joseph was a just man, yet being unwilling*, &c. whereas the manner in which he has connected the clauses, seems to make the latter explanatory of the former, rather than a contrast to it. It has indeed been said, that the participle *ων* sometimes admits being interpreted *though*. In proof of this, Mat. vii. 11. and Gal. ii. 3. have been quoted. But the construction is not similar in either passage. Here the *ων* is coupled with another participle by the conjunction *και*. In the places referred to, it is immediately followed by a verb in the indicative.

In such cases, to which the present has no resemblance, the words connected may give the force of an adversative to the participle. On the other hand, I have not seen sufficient evidence for rendering *δικαιος humane* or *merciful:* for though these virtues be sometimes comprehended under the term, they are not specially indicated by it. I have therefore chosen a middle way, as more unexceptionable than either. Every body knows that the word *δικαιος* admits two senses. The first is *just*, in the strictest acceptation, attentive to the rules of equity in our dealings, particularly what concerns our judicial proceedings. The second is *righteous* in the most extensive sense, including every essential part of a good character. In this sense it is equivalent, as Chr. remarks, to the epithet *εναρετος*, *virtuous*, *worthy*, *upright*. And in this not uncommon sense of the word, the last clause serves to exemplify the character, and not to contrast it.

[2] *To expose her*, *αυτην παραδειγματισαι*. E. T. *to make her a public example*. In order to express things forcibly, translators often, overlooking the modesty of the original, say more than the author intended. It has not, however, been sufficiently adverted to, in this instance, that by extending the import of the word *παραδειγματισαι*, they diminish the character of benignity ascribed, by the historian, to Joseph. It was not the writer's intention to say barely, that Joseph was unwilling to drag her as a criminal before the judges, and get the ignominious sentence of death, warranted by law, pronounced against her, which few perhaps would have done, more than he; but that he was desirous to consult privacy in the manner of dismissing her, that he might, as little as possible, wound her reputation. The word appears to me to denote no more than making the affair too flagrant, and so exposing her to shame. So the Syrian interpreter, and the Arabian, understood the term. I have therefore chosen here to follow the example of the Vul. Leo. and Cal. who render the words, *eam traducere*, rather than that of Cast. and Pisc. who render them, *in eam exemplum edere*, and *eam exemplum facere*, which have been followed by our translators. The expressions used by these naturally suggest to our minds a condemnation to suffer the rigour of the law. Yet the original word seems to relate solely to the disgrace resulting from the opinion of the public, and not to any other punishment, corporal or pecuniary. Infamy is, indeed, a common attendant on every sort of public punishment. Hence by

a synecdoche of a part for the whole, it has been sometimes employed to express a public and shameful execution. And this has doubtless occasioned the difficulty. But that it is frequently and most properly used, when no punishment is meant, but the publication of the crime, Raphelius, in his notes on the place, has, by his quotations from the most approved authors, put beyond a doubt. I shall bring one out of many. It is from Polybius, Legat. 88. where he says, *Η δε συγκλητος χρωμενη τω καιρω, και βουλομενη ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙΓΜΑΤΙΣΑΙ τους Ροδιους, αποκριδιν εξεβαλεν ης ην τα δυνεχοντα ταυτα.* "The senate taking the opportunity, and willing to *expose* the Rhodians, published their answer, whereof these are the heads." I shall only add, that Ch. one of the most eloquent of the Gr. fathers, understood this passage in the Gospel as meaning no more; accurately distinguishing between *παραδειγματιζειν* and *κολαζειν*, *exposing and punishing*. Thus he argues concerning Joseph's conduct on this trying occasion: *Καιτοιγε ου ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙΓΜΑΤΙΣΜΟΥ μονον ην υπευθυνος ἡ τοιαυτη· αλλα και ΚΟΛΑΖΕΣΘΑΙ αυτην ὁ νομος εκελευεν. Αλλ' ὁ Ιωσηφ ου μονον το μειζον εκεινο, αλλα και το ελαττον συνεχωρησε, την αισχυνην· ου γαρ μονον ου ΚΟΛΑΣΑΙ, αλλ' ουδε ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙΓΜΑΤΙΣΑΙ εβουλετο.* "Now "such a woman (as Mary was then thought to be) was not only expo- "sed to *shame*, but also by law subjected to *punishment*. Whereas "Joseph not only remitted the greater evil, the *punishment*, but the "less also, the *ignominy*; for he determined not only not to *punish*, "but not even to *expose* her." For the meaning of a term which occurs in so few places in Scripture, and those not unfavourable to the explanation given, a term with which no ancient controversy was connected, the authority of such a man as Chr. is justly held decisive. The verdict of Euth. is in effect the same. This also is the sense which the translator into M. G. gives the term, saying, *μη θελοντας να την φανερωση*, adding as an illustration on the margin, *να την πομπευση*, *to defame her*.

[3] *To divorce her*, *απολυσαι αυτην*. In the N. T. the word *απολυειν* is the ordinary term for *divorcing* a wife, and thereby dissolving the marriage. Nor did it make any difference in the Jewish commonwealth, that the parties were only betrothed to each other, and that the marriage was not completed by cohabitation. From the moment of their reciprocal engagement, all the laws in relation to

marriage were in force between them. He was her husband, and she his wife. Her infidelity to him was adultery, and appointed to be punished as such, Deut. xxii. 23, 24. In conformity to this is the style of our Evangelist. Joseph is called, v. 16. Mary's *husband*; she, v. 20. his *wife*; the dissolution of their contract is expressed by the same word that is uniformly used for the dissolution of marriage by the *divorce* of the wife. I have preferred here and in other places, the term *divorcing*, to that of *putting away*. The latter phrase is very ambiguous. Men are said to *put away* their wives, when they put them out of their houses, and will not live with them. Yet the marriage union still subsists; and neither party is at liberty to marry another. This is not what is meant by απολυειν την γυναικα in the Gospel. Now a divorce with them might be very private. It required not, as with us, a judicial process. The determination of the husband alone was sufficient. Deut. xxiv. 1, 2. The utmost, in point of form, required by the rabbies, (for the law does not require so much) was that the writing should be delivered to the wife, in presence of two subscribing witnesses. It was not even necessary that they should know the cause of the proceeding. They were called solely to attest the fact. Now as the instrument itself made no mention of the cause, and as the practice of divorcing, on the most trifling pretences, was become common, it hardly affected a woman's reputation, to say, that she had been divorced. I should in some places prefer the term *repudiate*, were it in more familiar use.

20. *A messenger*, αγγελος. Diss. VIII. P. III. § 9, &c.

22. *Verified*, πληρωθη. E. T. *fulfilled*. Though it should be admitted, that the word πληρωθη is here used in the strictest sense, to express the fulfilment of a prophecy, which pointed to this single event: it cannot be denied that the general import of the verb πληροω, in the Gospel, is more properly expressed by the Eng. verb *verify*, than by *fulfil*. Those things are said πληρωθηναι, which are no predictions of the future, but mere affirmations concerning the present, or the past. Thus, ch. ii. 15. a declaration from the Prophet Hosea, xi. 1. which God made in relation to the people of Israel, whom he had long before recalled from Egypt, is applied by the historian allusively to Jesus Christ, where all that is meant is, that, with equal truth, or rather with much greater energy of signification, God

might now say, *I have recalled my Son out of Egypt.* Indeed the import of the Greek phrase, as commonly used by the sacred writers, is no more, as L. Cl. has justly observed, than that such words of any of the Prophets may be applied with truth to such an event. For it is even used, where that which is said to be fulfilled is not a prophecy, but a command; and where the event spoken of is not the obedience of the command (though the term is sometimes used in this sense also), but an event similar to the thing required; and which, if I may so express myself, tallies with the words. Thus, in the directions given about the manner of preparing the paschal lamb, it is said, Exod. xii. 46. *None of his bones shall be broken.* This saying the Evangelist J. xix. 36. finds *verified* in what happened to our Lord, when the legs of the criminals, who were crucified with him, were broken, and his were spared. 'But were not the recal of Israel from Egypt, and the ceremonies of the passover, typical of what happened to our Lord?' I admit they were. But it is not the correspondence of the anti-type to the type, that we call properly *fulfilling:* this English word, if I mistake not, is, in strictness, applied only, either to an event to which a prophecy directly points, or to the performance of a promise. Whereas the Greek word is sometimes employed in Scripture to denote little more than a coincidence in sound. In this sense I think it is used, ch. ii. 23. We have an instance of its being employed by the Seventy, to denote *verifying*, or *confirming*, the testimony of one, by the testimony of another, 1 Kings. i. 14. The word *fulfilling*, in our language, has a much more limited signification: and to employ it for all those purposes, is to give a handle to cavillers, where the original gives none. It makes the sacred penmen appear to call those things predictions, which plainly were not, and which they never meant to denominate predictions. The most apposite word that I could find in English is *verify;* for, though it will not answer in every case, it answers in more cases than any other of our verbs. Thus, a prophecy is *verified* (for the word is strictly applicable here also), when it is accomplished; a promise, when it is performed; a testimony, when it is confirmed by additional testimony, or other satisfactory evidence; a maxim or proverb, when it is exemplified; a declaration of any kind may be said to be *verified* by any incident to which the words can be applied. I acknowledge that this word does not, in every case, correspond to πληροω. A law

is *fulfilled*, not *verified;* and if the import of the passage be to denote that additional strength is given to it, it is better to say *confirmed*, or *ratified*. In some places it means to *fill up*, in others to *perfect*, in others to *make known*. Thus much I thought it necessary to observe, in regard to my frequent use of a verb which is but rarely to be found in other Eng. translations.

[2] *Ινα πληρωθη*, literally, *that it might be verified*. The conjunction, in all such cases, denotes no more, than that there was as exact a conformity between the event and the passage quoted, as there could have been, if the former had been effected, merely for the accomplishment of the latter. God does not bring about an event, because some Prophet had foretold it: but the Prophet was inspired to foretel it, because God had previously decreed the event. If such particles as *ινα*, or *οπως*, were to be always rigorously interpreted, we should be led into the most absurd conclusions. For instance, we should deduce from J. xix. 24. that the Roman soldiers, Pagans, who knew nothing of holy writ, acted, in dividing our Lord's garments, and casting lots for his vesture, not from any desire of sharing the spoil, but purely with a view that the Scriptures relating to the Messiah might be fulfilled; for it is said that they resolved on this measure, *ινα η γραφη πληρωθη η λεγουσα*.—See note on ch. viii. 17.

[3] *In all this—was verified. τουτο δε ολον γεγονεν ινα πληρωθη*. Chr. and some others have considered this and v. 23. as spoken by the angel to Joseph; I consider these verses as containing a remark of the evangelist. By messages from heaven, particular orders are communicated, and particular revelations given. But I do not find this method taken, for teaching us how to interpret former revelations: whereas such applications of scripture are common with the evangelists, and with none more than with Mt. The very phrase *τουτο δε ολον γεγονεν*, with which this is introduced, he repeatedly employs in other places. (ch. xxi. 4. xxvi. 56.) Add to all this, that the interpretation given of the name Immanuel, *God with us*, is more apposite, in the mouth of a man, than in that of an angel.

23. *The virgin, η παρθενος*. I do not say that the article is always emphatical, though it is generally so; or that there is a particular emphasis on it, in this passage, as it stands in the Gospel.

But the words are in this place a quotation; and it is proper that the quotation should be exhibited, when warranted by the original, as it is in the book quoted. Both the Sep. and the Heb. in the passage of Isaiah referred to, introduce the name *virgin* with the article; and as in this they have been copied by the Evangelist, the article ought doubtless to be preserved in the translation.

25. *Her first-born son, τον υἱον αυτης τον πρωτοτοκον.* As there were certain prerogatives, which, by the Jewish constitution, belonged to primogeniture, those entitled to the prerogatives were invariably denominated *the first-born*, whether the parents had issue afterwards or not. Nothing, therefore, in relation to this point, can be inferred from the epithet here used. The turn which Mr. Wes. and others, have given the expression in their versions, *her son, the first-born*, though to appearance more literal, is neither so natural nor so just as the common translation. It is founded on the repetition of the article before the word *first-born.* But is it possible that they should not have observed, that nothing is more common in Gr. when an adjective follows its substantive, especially if a pronoun or other word intervene, than to repeat the article before the adjective? This is indeed so common, that it is accounted an idiom of the tongue, insomuch that, where it is omitted, there appears rather an ellipsis in the expression. Sc. in his notes on this verse, has produced several parallel expressions from Scripture, which it would be ridiculous to translate in the same manner; and which therefore clearly evince that there is no emphasis in the idiom.

[2] In regard to the preceding clause, *Joseph knew her not, until ἑως ὁυ;* all we can say, is, that it does not necessarily imply his knowledge of her afterwards. That the expression suggests the affirmative rather than the negative, can hardly be denied by any candid critic. The quotations, produced in support of the contrary opinion, are not entirely similar to the case in hand, as has been proved by Dr. Wh. in his commentary. And as there appears here no Hebraism, or peculiarity of idiom, to vindicate our giving a different turn to the clause, I cannot approve Beau.'s manner of rendering it, though not materially different in sense: *Mais il ne l'avoit point connu lors qu'elle mit au monde son fils premier né.* The P.

R. translation and Si.'s are to the same purpose. The only reason which a translator could have here for this slight deviation, was a reason which cannot be justified; to render the Evangelist's expression more favourable, or at least less unfavourable, to his own sentiments. But there is this good lesson to be learnt, even from the manner wherein some points have been passed over by the sacred writers; namely, that our curiosity in regard to them is impertinent; and that our controversies concerning them savour little of the knowledge, and less of the spirit, of the Gospel.

CHAPTER II.

1. *Eastern Magians*, μαγοι απο ανατολων. E. T. *wise men from the East;* rendering the word μαγοι, as though it were synonymous with σοφοι. This is not only an indefinite, but an improper version of the term. It is indefinite, because those called μαγοι, were a particular class, party, or profession among the Orientals, as much as Stoics, Peripatetics, and Epicureans, were among the Greeks. They originated in Persia, but afterwards spread into other countries, particularly into Assyria and Arabia, bordering upon Judea on the East. It is probable that the Magians here mentioned came from Arabia. Now to employ a term for specifying one sect, which may, with equal propriety, be applied to fifty, of totally different, or even contrary, opinions, is surely a vague manner of translating. It is also, in the present acceptation of the word, improper. Formerly the term *wise men* denoted philosophers, or men of science and erudition; it is hardly ever used so now, unless in burlesque. Dod. perhaps comes nearer, in using the term *sages:* as this term is sometimes appropriated, though seldom seriously in prose, to men of study and learning: but it is still too indefinite and general, since it might have been equally applied to Indian Bramins, Gr. philosophers and many others; whereas the term here employed is applicable to one sect only. This is, therefore, one of those cases wherein the translator, that he may do justice to his author, and not mislead his readers, is obliged to retain the original term. Diss. VIII. P. II. § 1. Sc. and others say *Magi;* I have preferred Prideaux's term *Magians;* both as having more the form

of an Eng. word, and as the singular *Magian*, for which there is occasion in another place, is much better adapted to our ears, especially when attended with an article, than *Magus*. The studies of the *Magians* seem to have lien principally in astronomy, natural philosophy, and theology. It is from them we derive the terms *magic* and *magician*, words which were doubtless used originally in a good, but are now always used in a bad, sense.

2. *We have seen his star in the east country*, ειδομεν αυτου τον αστερα εν τη ανατολη. E. T. *we have seen his star in the East*. To see either star or meteor in the East, means in Eng. to see it in the east quarter of the heavens, or looking eastwards. But this is not the Apostle's meaning here. The meaning here manifestly is, that when the Magians themselves were in the East, they saw the star. So far were they from seeing the star in the East, according to the Eng. acceptation of the phrase, that they must have seen it in the West, as they were, by its guidance, brought out of the east country westwards to Jerusalem. Thus the plural of the same word, in the preceding verse, signifies the countries lying east from Judea, μαγοι απο ανατολων. Some render the phrase εν τη ανατολη, *at its rise*. But, 1st, The words in that case ought to have been, εν τη ανατολη αυτου ; 2dly, The term is never so applied in Scripture to any of the heavenly luminaries, except the sun ; 3dly, It is very improbable that a luminous body, formed solely for giving the Magians to Bethlehem, would appear to perform the diurnal revolution of the heavens from East to West. The expression used in Lu.'s version, **im morgenlande**, coincides entirely with that here employed.

[2] *To do him homage*, προσκυνησαι αυτω. The homage of prostration, which is signified by this Gr. word, in sacred authors, as well as in profane, was, throughout all Asia, commonly paid to kings and other superiors, both by Jews and by Pagans. It was paid by Moses to his father-in-law, Exod. xviii. 7. called in the E. T. *obeisance*. The instances of this application are so numerous, both in the O. T. and in the N. as to render more quotations unnecessary. When God is the object, the word denotes adoration in the highest sense. In old Eng. the term *worship* was indifferently used of both. It is not commonly so now.

4. *The chief priests, τους αρχιερεις.* By the term *αρχιερεις, chief priests,* in the N. T. is commonly meant, not only those who were, or had been *high priests* (for this office was not then, as formerly, for life), but also the heads of the twenty-four courses, or sacerdotal families, into which the whole priesthood was divided.

[2] *Scribes of the people, γραμματεις του λαου;* the men of letters, interpreters of the law, and instructers of the people.

5. *Bethlehem of Judea, Βηθλεεμ της Ιουδαιας.* Vul. both here and v. 1. *Bethlehem Judæ,* this reading has no support from either MSS. or versions, and appears to be a conjectural emendation of Jerom, suggested by the Heb. of the Nazarenes.

6. *In the canton of Judah, γη Ιουδα.* E. T. *in the land of Juda.* The word *γη,* without the article joined to the name of a tribe, also without the article, denotes the *canton* or territory assigned to that tribe. In this sense, *γη Ζαβουλων,* and *γη Ναφθαλειμ,* occur in ch. iv. 15. As the land of Judah might be understood for the country of Judea, I thought it proper to distinguish in the version things sufficiently distinguished in the original.

[3] *Art not the least illustrious among the cities of Judah, ουδαμως ελαχιστη ει εν τοις ηγεμοσιν Ιουδα.* E. T. *Art not the least among the princes of Judah.* The term *ηγεμων,* in this place, denotes, *illustrious, eminent.* The metaphor *prince,* applied to city, is rather harsh in modern languages. It is remarked, that this quotation agrees not exactly either with the Heb. text, or with the Gr. version. There appears even a contradiction in the first clause to both these, as in them there is no negative particle. The most approved way of reconciling them, is by supposing that the words in the Prophet are an interrogation, which, agreeably to the idiom of most languages, is equivalent to a negation. On this hypothesis we must read in the O. T. *Art thou the least?* And in written language, an interrogation is not always to be distinguished from a declaration; though in speaking it may, by the emphasis, be clearly distinguishable. But, whatever be in this, it ought to be observed, that the quotation is only reported by the Evangelist, as part of the answer returned to Herod, by the chief priests and the scribes.

7. *Procured from them exact information, ηκριβωσε παρ' αυτων.* E. T. *Inquired of them diligently.* In conformity to

this is the greater part of modern translations. The Vul. renders it *diligenter didicit ab eis*, making very rightly the import of the verb ακριβοω to lie chiefly, not in the diligence of the inquiry, but in the success of it. Agreeable to this are most of the ancient versions, particularly the Sy. and the Ara. Dod. and Sc. have preferred these, and rendered the words, *Got exact information from them.* That this is more conformable to the import of the word, is evident from v. 16. where Herod makes use of the information he had gotten, for directing his emissaries in the execution of the bloody purpose on which they were sent; *according to the time* (as our translators express it) *which he had diligently inquired of the wise men.* This is not perfectly intelligible. It could not be the questions put by Herod, but the answers returned by the Magians, which could be of use for directing them. But, though the versions of Sc. and Dod. are preferable to the common one, they do not hit entirely the meaning of the Gr. word. It signifies, indeed, to get exact information, but not accidentally, or anyhow; it is only in consequence of inquiry, or at least of means used on the part of the informed. Be. has not badly rendered the verb, *exquisivit*, searched out, denoting both the means employed, and the effect. The better to show that this was his idea, he has given his explanation in the margin, *Certo et explorate cognovit.*

12. *Being warned in a dream*, χρηματισθεντες κατ' οναρ. E. T. *Being warned of God in a dream.* With this agree some ancient, and most modern translations, introducing the term *response*, *oracle*, *divinity*, or something equivalent. The Syr. has preserved the simplicity of the original, importing only, *it was signified to them in a dream*, and is followed by L. Cl. That the warning came from God, there can be no doubt: but as this is not expressed, but implied, in the original, it ought to be exhibited in the same manner in the version. What is said explicitly in the one, should be said explicitly in the other; what is conveyed only by implication in the one, should be conveyed only by implication in the other. Now that χρηματιζειν does not necessarily imply *from God*, more than the word *warning* does, is evident from the reference which, both in sacred authors and in classical, it often has to inferior agents. See Acts x. 22. where the name of God is indeed both unnecessarily and improperly introduced in the translation, xi.

26. Rom. vii. 3. Heb. xii. 25. For Pagan authorities, see Raphelius.

16. *Deceived*, ενεπαιχθη. E. T. *mocked.* In the Jewish style, we find often that any treatment which appears disrespectful, comes under the general appellation of *mockery.* Thus, Potiphar's wife, in the false accusation she preferred against Joseph, of making an attempt upon her chastity, says that *he came in to mock her*, Gen. xxxix. 17. *Εμπαιξαι* is the word employed by the Seventy. Balaam accused his ass of *mocking him*, when she would not yield to his direction, Num. xxii. 29. And Dalilah said to Samson, Jud. xvi. 10. *Thou hast mocked* (that is, *deceived) me, and told me lies.* As one who deceived them, appeared to treat them contemptuously, they were naturally led to express the former by the latter. But as we cannot do justice to the original, by doing violence to the language which we write, I thought it better to give the sense of the author, than servilely to trace his idiom.

[a] *The male children*, τους παιδας. Thus also Dod. and others. E. T. *The children.* Sc. follows this version, but says in the notes, " Perhaps *male children :*" adding, " Not that the masculine article τους excludes *female children :* for had our historian intended to include both sexes under one word, παιδας, he would have prefixed the masculine article as now." But how does he know that? In support of his assertion he has not produced a single example. He has shown, indeed, what nobody doubts, that as παις is of the common gender, the addition of αρρην or θηλυ serves to distinguish the sex without the article. But it is also true, that the attendance of the article ὁ or ἡ answers the purpose, without the addition of αρρην or θηλυ. *Pueri* and *puellæ* are not more distinguished by the termination in Latin, than οἱ παιδες and αἱ παιδες are distinguished by the article in Greek. I do not deny, that there may be instances wherein the term οἱ παιδες, like οἱ υἱοι, may mean children in general. The phrase, both in Hebrew and in Greek, is *the sons of Israel*, which our translators render, *the children of Israel*, as nobody doubts that the whole posterity is meant. We address an audience of men and women, by the title *brethren ;* and under the denomination, *all men*, the whole species is included. But in such examples, the universality of the application is either previously known from common usage, or is manifest from the subject or occa-

sion. Where this cannot be said, the words ought to be strictly interpreted. Add to this, 1st, That the historian seems here purposely to have changed the term παιδιον, which is used for *child* no fewer than nine times in this chapter; as that word being neuter, and admitting only the neuter article, was not fit for marking the distinction of sexes; and to have adopted a term which he no where else employs for infants, though frequently for men-servants, and once for youths or boys: 2dly, That the reason of the thing points to the interpretation I have given. It made no more for Herod's purpose to destroy female children, than to massacre grown men and women; and, tyrant though he was, that he meant to go no farther than, in his way of judging, his own security rendered expedient, is evident from the instructions he gave to his emissaries, in regard to the age of the infants to be sacrificed to his jealousy, that they might not exceed such an age, or be under such another.

[3] *From those entering the second year, down to the time,* απο διετους και κατωτερω, κατα τον χρονον. E. T. *From two years old and under, according to the time.* There can be no doubt, that in this direction Herod intended to specify both the age above which, and the age under which, infants were not to be involved in this massacre. But there is some scope for inquiry into the import of the description given. Were those of the second year included, or excluded by it? By the common translation they are included; by that given above, excluded. Plausible things may be advanced on each side. The reasons which have determined me, are as follows. The word διετης is one of those which, in scriptural criticism, we call απαξ λεγομενα. It occurs in no other place of the N. T. nor in the Sep. It is explained by Hesychius and Phavorinus, that which lives a whole year, δι ὁλου του ετους. Διετηδιος is also explained in our common lexicons, *per totum annum durans, anniversarius:* and the verb διετιζω is used by Aristotle for *living a whole year.* At the same time it must be owned, that the explanation *bimulus, biennis,* is also given to the word διετης. The term is therefore doubtless equivocal; but what weighs with me here principally is, the ordinary method used by the Jews in reckoning time; which is to count the imperfect days, months, or years, as though they were complete, speaking of a period begun, as if it were ended. Thus it is said, Gen. xvii. 12. *The child that is eight days old among you shall be circumcised;* and Lev. xii. 3. *On the eighth day he shall be cir-*

cumcised. Now it is evident, that in the way this precept was understood, it behoved them often to circumcise their children when they were not seven days old, and never to wait till they were eight. For the day of the birth, however little of it remained, was reckoned the first; and the day of the circumcision, however little of it was spent, was reckoned the eighth. But nothing can set this matter in a stronger light than what is recorded of our Lord's death and resurrection. We are told by himself, that he was to be three days and three nights in the bosom of the earth; that his enemies would kill him, and that after three days he would rise again. Yet certain it is, that our Lord was not two days, or forty-eight hours, (though still part of three days), under the power of death. He expired late on the sixth day of the week, and rose early on the first of the ensuing week. Both these considerations lead me to conclude, with Wh. and Dod. that Herod, by the instructions given to his messengers, meant to make the highest limit of their commission, those entering, not finishing the second year. The lowest we are not told, but only that it was regulated by the information he had received from the Magians; for this I take to be the import of the clause, *κατα τον χρονον.* He had probably concluded, that the star did not appear till the birth, though they might not see it on its first appearance, and that, therefore, he could be in no danger from children born long before, or at all after, it had been seen by them. Supposing then, it had appeared just half a year before he gave this cruel order, the import would be, that they should kill none above twelve months old, or under six.

18. *In Ramah, Ev Ραμα.* Ramah was a city on the confines of Benjamin, not far from Bethlehem in Judah. As Rachel was the the mother of Benjamin, she is here, by the Prophet Jeremiah, from whom the words are quoted, introduced as most nearly concerned. It is true, however, that in the Heb. the term rendered *in Ramah,* may be translated *on high.* And both Origen and Jerom were of opinion that it ought to be so translated. But the authors of the Sep. have thought otherwise; and it is more than probable that the Evangelist, or his translator, have judged it best to follow that version. The mention of Rachel as lamenting on this occasion, gives a probability to the common version of the Prophet's expression. Otherwise it would have been more natural to exhibit Leah the

mother of Judah, than Rachel the mother of Benjamin, as inconsolable on account of a massacre perpetrated in a city of Judah, and aimed against one of that tribe.

[3] *Lamentation and weeping, and bitter complaint, θρηνος και κλαυθμος και οδυρμος πολυς.* Vul. *Ploratus et ululatus multus.* In three Gr. copies *θρηνος και* are wanting. All the three words are in the Sep. in the passage referred to, though there are but two corresponding words in the Heb. In most of the ancient versions there is the same omission as in the Vul.

22. *Hearing that Archelaus had succeeded his father Herod in the throne of Judea, he was afraid to return thither.* Archelaus was constituted by Augustus *ethnarch* (that is, ruler of the nation, but in title inferior to *king*) over Judea, Samaria, and Idumea. The Orientals, however, commonly gave to such, and indeed to all sovereigns, the appellation of *kings.* The emperor is repeatedly so named in Scripture. And here the word *εβασιλευσεν* is applied to Archelaus, who succeeded his father, not in title, but in authority, over the principal part, not the whole, of his dominions. But though Joseph was afraid to go into Judea, strictly so called, he still continued in the land of Israel; for under that name, *Galilee* and a considerable extent of country lying east of the Jordan, were included. Prel. Diss. I. P. I. § 7.

23. *That he should be called a Nazarene, ότι Ναζωραιος κληθησεται.* E. T. *He shall be called a Nazarene.* The words may be rendered either way. A direct quotation is often introduced with the conjunction *ότι.* On the other hand, that the verb is in the indicative is no objection, of any weight, against translating the passage obliquely. The Heb. has no subjunctive mood, and therefore the indicative in the N. T. is often used subjunctively, in conformity to the Oriental idiom. And, as there is no place, in the Prophets still extant, where we have this affirmation in so many words, I thought it better to give an oblique turn to the expression.

[2] *Nazarene.* To mark a difference between *Ναζωραιος*, the term used here, and *Ναζαρηνος*, the common word for an inhabitant of Nazareth, Sc. and Dod. say *Nazaræan*, Wa. says *Nazorean.* But as the term *Ναζωραιος* is, by this evangelist, (xxvi. 71) used manifestly in the same sense, and also by both Mr. and J. I can see no reason for this small variation. Some find a coincidence in the name with a Heb. word for a *Nazarite;* others for a word signify-

ing *branch*, a term by which the Messiah, in the judgment of Jews, as well as of Christians, is denominated, Isaiah xi. 1.

It is proper to observe that, in the Heb. exemplar of this Gospel which was used by the Ebionites, and called *The Gospel according to the Hebrews*, the two first chapters were wanting :—the book began in this manner, *It happened, in the days of Herod king of Judea, that John came baptizing, with the baptism of reformation, in the river Jordan. He was said to be of the race of Aaron the priest, and son of Zacharias and Elizabeth.* But for this reading, and the rejection of the two chapters, there is not one concurrent testimony from MSS. versions, or ancient authors. It is true the Al. has not the two chapters; but this is no authority for rejecting them, as that copy is mutilated, and contains but a very small fragment of Mt.'s Gospel. No fewer than the twenty-four first chapters are wanting, and the copy begins with the verb *ερχεται*, *cometh*, in the middle of a sentence, ch. xxv. 6. By a like mutilation, though much less considerable, the first nineteen verses of the first chapter are wanting in the Cam. which also begins in the middle of a sentence with the verb *παραλαβειν*, *to take home*. And in the Go. version all is wanting before the middle of the fifteenth verse of ch. v. It begins likewise in the middle of a sentence with the words answering to *επι την λυχνιαν*. Now if we abstract from these, which prove nothing, but that the words they begin with were preceded by something now lost; there is a perfect harmony in the testimonies, both of MSS. and of versions, in favour of the two chapters. The old Itc. translation and the Syr. were probably made before the name *Ebionite*, was known in the church. Even so early a writer as Irenæus, in the fragment formerly quoted (Pref. § 7.), takes notice that Mt. began his history with the genealogy of Jesus. That the Nazarenes, (or Jewish christians, on whom, though disciples, the Mosaic ceremonies were, by themselves, thought binding) who also used a Heb. exemplar of this gospel, had the two chapters, is probable, as Epiphanius calls their copy very full, *πληρεστατον*, though, it must be owned, he immediately after expresses some doubt of their retaining their pedigree. Si. thinks it probable that they did retain it, as he learns from Epiphanius that Carpocras and Cerinthus, whose notions pretty much coincided with theirs, retained it, and even used it in arguing against their adversaries. I might add to the

testimony of versions, MSS. and ancient authors, the internal evidence we have of the vitiation of the Ebionite exemplar, the only copy that is charged with this defect, from the very nature of the additions and alterations it contains.

CHAPTER III.

1. *In those days.* As the thing last mentioned was the residence of Jesus with his parents at Nazareth, the words *those days* may be used with strict propriety of any time before he left that city. Now John was about six months older than Jesus; it may therefore be thought not improbable that he began his public ministry so much earlier, each in the 30th year of his age, agreeably to the practice of the Levites, Num. iv. 3. But it must be owned that this is no more than conjecture: for as to the age of the Baptist, when he commenced preacher, scripture has been silent.

[2] *The Baptist, ὁ Βαπτιστης.* A title from his office, not a proper name. It is equivalent to the title given him, Mr. vi. 14. *ὁ Βαπτιζων, the Baptizer.* It is therefore improperly rendered into modern languages without the article, as Dio. has done in Itn. calling him *Giovanni Battista*, and all the Fr. translators I know (except L. Cl.), who call him *Jean Baptiste.*

[3] *Cried, κηρυσσων.* Diss. VI. P. V.

[4] *Wilderness, ερημω.* Mr. i. 3. N.

2. *Reform, μετανοειτε.* Diss. VI. P. III.

[2] *Reign, βασιλεια.* Diss. V. P. I.

4. *Of camel's hair*, not of the fine hair of that animal, whereof an elegant kind of cloth is made, which is thence called *camlet* (in imitation of which, though made of wool, is the English *camlet*), but of the long and shaggy hair of camels, which is in the East manufactured into a coarse stuff, anciently worn by monks and anchorets. It is only when understood in this way that the words suit the description here given of John's manner of life.

[2] *Locusts, ακριδες.* I see no ground to doubt that it was the animal so named that is meant here. *Locusts* and *grasshoppers* are among the things allowed by the law to be eaten, Lev. xi. 22. and are, at this day, eaten in Asia, by the poorer sort; I have never had satisfactory evidence that the word is susceptible of any other interpretation.

5. *The country along the Jordan,* ἡ περιχωρος του Ιορδανου. Mr. i. 28. N.

7. *From the impending vengeance,* απο της μελλουσης οργης. E. T. *From the wrath to come.* Μελλων often means not only *future,* but *near.* There is just such a difference between εσται and μελλει εσεσθαι, in Gr. as there is between *it will be* and *it is about to be,* in Eng. This holds particularly in threats and warnings. Εσται λιμος is *erit fames; μελλει εσεσθαι λιμος* is *imminet fames.* In Job iii. 8. a Heb. word signifying *ready, prepared,* is rendered by the Seventy μελλων. Besides, its connexion with the verb φυγειν in this verse ascertains the import of the word. We think of fleeing only when pursued. The flight itself naturally suggests to spectators that the enemy is at hand. In cases however wherein no more appears to be intended than the bare prediction of an event, or declaration of some purpose, we are to consider it as equivalent to an ordinary future, ch. xvii. 22. N. The words, *the wrath to come,* appear to limit the sense to what is strictly called *the future judgment.*

8. *The proper fruit of reformation,* καρπους αξιους της μετανοιας. E. T. *fruits meet for repentance.* Vul. *fructum dignum pœnitentiæ.* A very great number of MSS. read καρπον αξιον, amongst which are some of the oldest and most valued; likewise several ancient versions, as the Ara. the second Sy. Cop. Eth. and Sax. It appears too, that some of the earliest fathers read in the same manner. Of the moderns, Lu. Gro. Si. Ben. Mill, and Wet. have approved it. It is so read in the Com. and some other old editions. Καρπους αξιους is universally allowed to be the genuine reading in L. Some ignorant transcriber has probably thought proper to correct one Gospel by the other. Such freedoms have been too often used.

10. *Turned into fuel.* Ch. vi. 30. [2] N.

11. *In water—in the Holy Spirit,* εν ὑδατι—εν ἁγιω πνευματι. E. T. *with water—with the Holy Ghost.* Vul. *in aqua—in Spiritu Sancto.* Thus also, the Sy. and other ancient versions. All the modern translations from the Gr. which I have seen, render the words as our common version does, except L. Cl. who says, *dans l'eau—dans le Saint Esprit.* I am sorry to observe that the Popish translators from the Vul. have shown greater veneration for the style of that version than the generality of Protestant translators have shown

for that of the original. For in this the La. is not more explicit than the Gr. Yet so inconsistent are the interpreters last mentioned, that none of them have scrupled to render *εν τω Ιορδανη*, in the sixth verse, in *Jordan*, though nothing can be plainer, than that if there be any incongruity in the expression *in water*, this *in Jordan* must be equally incongruous. But they have seen that the preposition *in* could not be avoided there, without adopting a circumlocution, and saying, *with the water of Jordan*, which would have made their deviation from the text too glaring. The word *βαπτιζειν*, both in sacred authors, and in classical, signifies, *to dip*, *to plunge*, *to immerse*, and was rendered by Tertullian, the oldest of the La. fathers, *tingere*, the term used for dying cloth, which was by immersion. It is always construed suitably to this meaning. Thus it is, *εν ὑδατι*, *εν τω Ιορδανη*. But I should not lay much stress on the preposition *εν*, which, answering to the Heb. ב, may denote *with* as well as *in*, did not the whole phraseology, in regard to this ceremony, concur in evincing the same thing. Accordingly the baptised are said *αναβαινειν*, *to arise*, *emerge*, or *ascend*, v. 16. *απο του ὑδατος*, and Acts viii. 39. *εκ του ὑδατος*, *from* or *out of the water*. Let it be observed further, that the verbs *ραινω* and *ραντιζω*, used in scripture for *sprinkling*, are never construed in this manner. *I will sprinkle you with clean water*, says God, Ezek. xxxvi. 25. or as it runs in the E. T. literally from the Heb. *I will sprinkle clean water upon you*, is in the Sept. *Ραινω εθ' ὑμας καθαρον ὑδωρ*, and not as *βαπτιζω* is always construed. *Ρανω ὑμας εν καθαρω ὑδατι*. See also Exod. xxix. 21. Lev. vi. 27. xvi. 14. Had *βαπτιζω* been here employed in the sense of *ραινω I sprinkle* (which as far as I know, it never is, in any use, sacred or classical) the expression would doubtless have been *Εγω μεν βαπτιζω εφ' υμας ὑδωρ*, or *απο του ὑδατος*, agreeably to the examples referred to. When therefore the Gr. word *βαπτιζω* is adopted, I may say, rather than translated into modern languages, the mode of construction ought to be preserved so far as may conduce to suggest its original import. It is to be regretted that we have so much evidence that even good and learned men allow their judgments to be warped by the sentiments and customs of the sect which they prefer. The true partizan, of whatever denomination, always inclines to correct the diction of the spirit, by that of the of the party.

[a] *In the Holy Spirit and fire*, εν πνευματι αγιω και πυρι. Hey. *with holy wind and fire.* This most uncommon, though not entirely new, version of that learned and ingenious, but sometimes fanciful, interpreter, is supported by the following arguments: 1st, The word πνευμα, which signifies both *spirit* and *wind*, has not here the article by which *the Holy Spirit* is commonly distinguished. 2dly, The following verse, which should be regarded as an illustration of this, mentions the cleansing of the wheat, which is by *the wind* separating the chaff, and the consuming of the chaff by *the fire.* 3dly, The three elements, water, air, and fire, were all considered by the Jews as purifiers, and, in respect of their purifying quality, were ranked in the order now named, water the lowest, and fire the highest. The mention of the other two gives a presumption that the third was not omitted. The following answers are submitted to the reader: 1st. The article, though often, for distinction's sake, prefixed to αγιον πνευμα, is, when either the scope of the place, or the other terms employed, serve the purpose of distinguishing, frequently omitted. Now this purpose is more effectually served by the epithet αγιον, *holy*, than it could have been by the article. In ch. i. 18. and 20. the miraculous conception is twice said to be εκ πνευματος αγιου, without the article. Yet Hey. himself has rendered it, in both places, *the Holy Spirit.* Further, I suspect that no clear example can be produced of this adjective joined to πνευμα, where the meaning of πνευμα is *wind.* At least I have never heard of any such. 2dly, The subsequent verse is certainly not to be understood as an illustration of this, but as farther information concerning Jesus. This verse repesents the manner in which he will admit his disciples; the next, that in which he will judge them at the end of the world. 3dly, I can see no reason, on the Dr.'s hypothesis, why *air* or *wind* should alone of all the elements be dignified with the epithet *holy.* *Fire*, in that view, would have a preferable title, being considered as the most perfect refiner of them all. Yet in no part of the N. T. is mention made of either *holy water* or *holy fire.* Now as it is acknowledged that πνευμα commonly signifies *spirit*, and when joined with αγιον *the Divine Spirit*, the word, by all the laws of interpretation, considering the peculiarity of the attribute with which it is accompanied, must be so understood here. It is however but doing justice to that respectable author to observe that he does not differ from others, in

regard to the principal view of the passage, the effusion of the Holy Spirit; only he thinks that the literal import of the word *πνευμα* in this place is *wind*, and that *the spirit* is but suggested to us, by a figure.

[3] *And fire, και πυρι.* These words are wanting in several MSS. but they are found in a greater number, as well as in the Sy. the Vul. and all the ancient versions.

12. *His winnowing shovel in his hand, ὁυ το πτυον εν τη χειρι αυτου.* E. T. *Whose fan is in his hand.* Vul. *Cujus ventilabrum in manu sua.* In the old Vul. or Itc. the word appears to have been *pala* properly *a winnowing shovel*, of which mention is made Isa. xxx. 24. This implement of husbandry is very ancient, simple, and properly manual. The *fan* (or *van*, as it is sometimes called,) is more complex, and being contrived for raising an artificial wind, by the help of sails, can hardly be considered as proper for being carried about in the hand.

15. *Thus ought we to ratify every institution, ούτω πρεπον εστιν ήμιν πληρωσαι πασαν δικαιοσυνην.* E. T. *Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.* In the opinion of Chrysostom, and other expositors, *δικαιοσυνη* signifies in this place *divine precept.* It is the word by which משפט *miskpat*, in Heb. often denoting an *institution* or *ordinance* of religion, is sometimes rendered by the Seventy. I have chosen here to translate the verb *πληρωσαι* rather *ratify* than *fulfil*, because the conformity of Jesus, in this instance, was not the personal obedience of one who was comprehended in the precept, and needed with others the benefit of purification, but it was the sanction of his example given to John's baptism as a divine ordinance.

16. *No sooner arose out of the water than heaven was opened to him, ανεβη ευθυς απο του ὑδατος, και ιδου ανεωχθησαν αυτω ὁι ουρανοι.* E. T. *Went up straightway out of the water, and lo the heavens were opened unto him.* That the adverb *ευθυς*, though joined with the first verb, does properly belong to the second, was justly remarked by Grotius. Of this idiom, Mr. i. 29. and xi. 2, are also examples.

CHAPTER IV.

1. *By the devil, ὑπο του διαβολου.* Diss. VI. P. I. § 1—6.

3. *A son of God, ὑιος του Θεου.* E. T. *The Son of God.* It does not appear to be without design that the article is omitted both in this verse and in the sixth. The words ought therefore to be rendered indefinitely *a son*, not emphatically *the son*. In the parallel passage in L. iv. 3. there is the same omission. And though in the 9th verse of that chapter we find the article in the present common Gr. it is wanting in so many ancient MSS. and approved editions, that it is justly rejected by critics. Whether we are to impute Satan's expressing himself thus to his ignorance, as not knowing the dignity of the personage whom he accosted, or to his malignity, as being averse to suppose more than an equality with other good men (for he does not acknowledge even so much); certain it is, that the passage he quotes from the Psalms, admits a general application to all pious persons. The omission of the definite article in this place is the more remarkable, as in the preceding chapter in both Gospels, the appropriation of the term *ὑιος* by means of the article, in the voice from heaven, is very strongly marked, *ὁ ὑιος μου ὁ αγαπητος*. See N. on ch. xiv. 33. xxvii. 54.

3 *Loaves, αρτοι.* E. T. *Bread. Αρτος*, used indefinitely, is rightly translated *bread;* but when joined with *ἑις*, or any other word limiting the signification in the singular number, ought to be rendered *loaf;* in the plural it ought almost always to be rendered *loaves*. Even if either were proper, *loaves* would be preferable in this place, as being more picturesque. Our translators have here followed the Sy. interpreter, who seems to have read *αρτος*.

4. *By every thing which God is pleased to appoint, επι παντι ρηματι εκπορευομενω δια στοματος Θεου.* E. T. *By every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.* The whole sentence is given as a quotation. *It is written.* The place quoted is Deut. viii. 3. where Moses, speaking to the Israelites, says, *He humbled thee, and suffered thee to hunger, and fed thee with manna, which thou knewest not, neither did thy fathers know; that he might make thee know that man doth not live by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord, doth man live.* It

is evident that the Jewish lawgiver is speaking here of the food of the body, or sustenance of the animal life; as it was this purpose solely which the manna served, and which could not, in our idiom, be denominated a *word*. The reader may observe that the term *word* in the passage of the O. T. quoted is, in our Bible, printed in Italics, to denote that there is no corresponding term in the original. It might therefore have been literally rendered from the Heb. *every thing*. In the Sep. from which the quotation in the Gospel is copied, the ellipsis is supplied by *ρημα*. But let it be observed, that in scripture both the Heb. דבר *dabar*, and the Gr. *ρημα*, and sometimes *λογος*, mean indifferently *word* or *thing*. Take the following examples out of a much greater number. L. i. 37. *Ουκ αδυνατησει παρα τω Θεω παν ρημα. Nothing is impossible with God.*—ii. 15. *Let us now go to Bethlehem, and see this thing, το ρημα τουτο, which is come to pass.* The phrase *το εκπορευομενον* (or *εξελθον*) *εκ του στοματος*, is oftener than once to be met with, in the version of the Seventy, for a *declared purpose*, *resolution*, or *appointment*. See Num. xxxii. 24. 1 Sam. i. 23. But nothing can be more express to our purpose than Jer. xliv. 17. *Ποιησομεν παντα λογον ὁς εξελευσεται εκ του στοματος ἡμων*. E. T. *We will do whatsoever thing goeth forth out of our own mouth, παντα λογον*, in Heb. כל הדבר, *col hadubar, every word*, that is, *we will do whatsoever we have purposed*. The version I have given is, therefore, entirely agreeable both to the sense of the passage quoted, and to the idiom of holy writ. I may add, that it is much better adapted to the context than the allegorical explanation which some give of the words, as relating purely to the spiritual life. The historian tells us that Jesus had fasted forty days, that he was hungry, and in a desert, where food was not to be had. The tempter, taking his opportunity, interposes, "If thou be the Messiah, convert these stones into loaves." The question was simply, What, in this exigence, was to be done for sustaining life? Our Saviour answers very pertinently, by a quotation from the O. T. purporting, that when the sons of Israel were in the like perilous situation in a desert, without the ordinary means of subsistence, God supplied them with food, by which their lives were preserved, (for it is not pretended that the manna served as spiritual nourishment), to teach us that no strait, however pressing, ought to shake our confidence in him. Beau. and the anonymous Eng. translator in 1729, exhibit the same sense in their versions.

6. *Lest, μηποτε.* E. T. *Lest at any time.* From an excessive solicitude, not to say less than the original, words have been explained from etymology, rather than from use; in consequence of which practice, some versions are encumbered with expletives, which enfeeble, instead of strengthening, the expression. Of this kind is the phrase *at any time*, which, in this passage adds nothing to the sense. The compound *μηποτε*, in the use of the sacred penmen, rarely signifies more than the simple *μη*, *lest*. It is used by the Seventy in translating a Heb. term that imports no more. In the Psalm referred to, it is rendered simply *lest*. And to go no farther than this Gospel, our translators have not hesitated to render it so in in the following passages, vii. 6. xiii. 29. xv. 32. xxv. 9. xxvii. 64. Why they have not done so in this and most other places, I can discover no good reason.

7. *Jesus again answered, It is written, εφη αυτω ὁ Ιησους παλιν γεγραπται.* E. T. *Jesus said unto him, it is written again.* The words in the original are susceptible of either interpretation, the difference depending entirely on the pointing. I place the comma after *παλιν*, they after *Ιησους*. This was the second answer which Jesus made, on this occasion, to the devil. It is not easy to say in what sense the words quoted can be said to have been written again. The punctuation is not of divine authority, any more than the division into chapters and verses.

Thou shalt not put the Lord thy God to the proof, ουκ εκπειρασεις Κυριον τον Θεον σου. E. T. *Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.* What we commonly mean by the word *tempting*, does not suit the sense of the Gr. word *εκπειραζω* in this passage. The Eng. word means properly either *to solicit to evil*, or *to provoke*; whereas the import of the Gr. verb in this and several other places is *to assay, to try, to put to the proof.* It is thus the word is used, Gen. xxii. 1. where God is said to have *tempted* Abraham, commanding him to offer up his son Isaac for a burnt offering. God did not solicit the patriarch to evil, for, in this sense, as the Apostle James tells us, i. 13. he neither can be tempted, nor tempteth any man. But God *tried* Abraham, as the word ought manifestly to have been rendered, putting his faith and obedience to the proof. His ready compliance, so far from being evil, was an evidence of the sublimest virtue. It was in desiring to have a proof of God's care of them, and

presence with them that the children of Israel are said to have *tempted the Lord at Massa*, saying, *Is the Lord among us or not?* Ex. xvii. 7. And on the present occasion, it was God's love to him, and faithfulness in the performance of his promise, that the devil desired our Lord, by throwing himself headlong from a precipice, to *make trial of*. As, however, it has been objected that this last phrase, which I at first adopted, is somewhat ambiguous, I have changed it for one which cannot be mistaken.

15. *On the Jordan, περαν του Ιορδανου.* E. T. *Beyond Jordan.* The Heb. word מעבר *megheber*, rendered by the Seventy *περαν*, signifies indifferently *on this side*, or *on the other side*. In Num. xxxii. 19. the word is used in both meanings in the same sentence. Unless therefore some other word or phrase is added, as *κατ' ανατολας*, or *κατα θαλασσαν*, to ascertain the sense, it ought to be rendered as in the text, or as in verse 25th. Zebulon and Naphtali were on the same side of the Jordan with Jerusalem and Judea, where Isaiah exercised his prophetical office.

[2] *Near the sea, ὁδον θαλασσης.* E. T. *By the way of the sea.* This expression is rather indefinite and obscure. There is an ellipsis in the original, but I have given the sense. What is here called *sea*, is properly, not *a sea*, but *a lake*. It was customary with the Hebrews to denominate a large extent of water, though fresh water, and encompassed with land, by the name *sea*. Both Mt. and Mr. denominate this *the sea of Galilee ;* J. calls it *the sea of Tiberias ;* L. more properly, *the lake of Gennesareth*. It was on this lake that Capernaum, and some other towns of note, were situated. Here also Peter and Andrew, James and John, before they were called to the apostleship, exercised the occupation of fishers. *The sea of Galilee*, and *the sea of Tiberias*, are become, in scripture-style, so much like proper names, that it might look affected to change them, for *the lake of Galilee*, and *the lake of Tiberias*. Besides, where it can conveniently be done, these small differences in phraseology, which diversify the styles of the Evangelists, in the original, ought to be preserved in the translation.

16. *A region of the shades of death, χωρα και σκια θανατου.* In the Sep. in the passage referred to, the words are *χωρα σκιας θανατου*, literally from the Heb. of the prophet, ארץ צל מות *arets tsalmoth*. *Tsal-moth*, it was observed, Diss. VI. P. II. § 2. and *sheol*,

are nearly synonymous, and answer to *ἅδης* in the N. T. which signifies the invisible word, or the state of the dead. The expression is here evidently metaphorical, and represents the ignorance or spiritual darkness in which the people of that region, who were intermixed with the heathen, lived, before they received the light of the Gospel.

17. *Began to proclaim, ηρξατο κηρυσσειν,* Mr. v. 17. N.

18. *A drag, αμφιβληστρον.* E. T. *A net.* The word is not the same here that is in the verse 20th; there it is *δικτυον*, which I take to be the name of the genus, and properly rendered *net.* The name here is that of a species answering to what we call *a drag.* The same historian, xiii. 47. uses the word *σαγηνη*, which in the common translation is also rendered *net.* It is not very material, but neither ought it to be altogether overlooked, to make, when possible in a consistency with propriety, the phraseology of the version both as various, and as special, as that of the original. Diss. XII. P. I. § 9—13.

21. *In the bark, εν τω πλοιω.* E. T. *In a ship.* L. v. 2. N.

[2] *Mending, καταρτιζοντας.* Mr. i. 19. N.

CHAPTER V.

3. *Happy, μακαριοι.* E. T. *Blessed.* I agree with those translators who choose generally to render *μακαριος happy, ευλογητος* and *ευλογημενος blessed.* The common version rarely makes a distinction.

[1] *Happy the poor, μακαριοι οι πτωχοι.* E. T. *Blessed are the poor.* Is has more energy in these aphoristical sentences, after the example of the original, and all the ancient versions, to omit the substantive verb. The idiom of our language admits this freedom as easily as the Itn. and more so than the Fr. None of the La. versions express the verb. Dio.'s Itn. does not; nor do the Fr. versions of P. R. L. Cl. and Sa.—Si. expresses it in the first beatitude, but not in the following ones. Another reason which induced me to adopt this manner is to render these aphorisms, in regard to happiness, as similar in form as they are in the original, to the aphorisms in regard to wretchedness, which are, L. vi. contrasted with them, *wo to you that are rich*—for I shall show, in the note on that pas-

sage, that the verb to be supplied is the indicative mood equally in both.

[3] *Happy the poor who repine not, μακαριοι οι πτωχοι τω πνευματι.* E. T. *Blessed are the poor in spirit.* I have assigned my reason, Diss. XI. P. I. § 18. for thinking that it is as much the business of a translator to translate phrases as to translate words. An idiomatic phrase stands precisely on the same footing with a compound word. The meaning is commonly learnt from the usual application of the whole word, or of the whole phrase, and not by the detached meanings of the several parts, which, in another language, conjoined, in the same manner, may convey either no meaning at all, or a meaning very different from the author's. Such, in a particular manner, is the meaning which the phrase *poor in spirit*, naturally conveys to English ears. *Poor-spirited*, which to appearance is coincident with it, is always employed in a bad sense, and denotes mean, dastardly, servile. *Poorness of spirit* is the same ill quality in the abstract. The phrase, therefore, in our language, if it can be said to suggest any sense, suggests one different from the sense in the text. In support of the interepretation here given, let the following things be attended to: First, That it is literally *the poor* that is meant, may be fairly concluded from the parallel place, L. vi. 20. where the like declaration is pronounced of *the poor* simply, without any limitation, as in this passage. And this is of considerable weight, whether we consider the discourse recorded by L. as the same, or different, since their coincidence in many things, and similarity in others, are confessed on all sides. Now what puts it beyond a doubt, that it is *the poor* in the proper sense that is meant there, is the characters contrasted to those pronounced *happy*. These begin v. 24. *Woe unto you that are rich.* It is also not without its weight, that our Lord begins with *the poor* on both occasions; but especially that the same beatitude is ascribed to both: *Theirs is the kingdom of heaven.* I might urge further that, if *the poor* be not meant here, there is none of these maxims that relates to them. Now this omission is very improbable, in ushering in the laws of a dispensation which was entitled, many ages before, *glad tidings to the poor;* to announce which was one great end of the Messiah's mission. And the fulfilment of this prophecy in him, is what our Lord fails not to observe on more occasions than one. I I cannot therefore agree with Wh. and others, in thinking that

πτωχοι τω πνευματι means *humble.* The quotations produced by that critic, in support of his opinion, are more foreign to his purpose than any thing I have yet discovered in his learned Commentaries. "The usual expression," says he, "by which the Scriptures [meaning the O. T.] and the Jewish writers represent the humble man is, that he is *shephal ruach*, i. e. poor, low, or contrite in his spirit." And of this he brings some examples. It is true, the meaning of *shephal* is humble, and of *ruach* is spirit. But because, in Scripture, men humble of spirit means humble men, must therefore *the poor in spirit* also mean humble men? To make the inconclusiveness of this reasoning pass unobserved, he has inserted the word *poor*, amongst others, in his explanation of the word *shephal.* But that it ever means *poor*, I have not found so much as a single example. It is never translated by the Seventy πτωχος; but either ταπεινος, or by some word of like import. As to the phrase *shephal ruach*, it occurs but thrice in Scripture. In one place it is rendered πραΰθυμος, in another ταπεινοφρων, and in the third ολιγοψυχος. Should any object, that to exclude *the humble* from a place here, will seem as unsuitable to the temper of our religion, as to exclude *the poor;* I answer, that I understand *the humble* to be comprehended under the third beatitude: *Happy the meek.* Not that I look upon the two words as strictly synonymous, but as expressing the same disposition under different aspects; *humility*, in the contemplation of self as in the divine presence; *meekness*, as regarding the conduct towards other men. This temper is accordingly opposed to pride as well as to anger. The words seem to have been often used indiscriminately. *Humble* in the Heb. is once and again by the Seventy rendered *meek*, and conversely; and they are sometimes so quoted in the N. T. Nay, the very phrase for *lowly in spirit*, above criticised, *shephal ruach*, is at one time rendered πραυθυμος, *meek-spirited*, at another, ταπεινοφρων, *humble.* But should it be asked, what then does τω πνευματι add to the sense of οι πτωχοι; I think the phrase to which Wh. recurs will furnish us with an answer. *Shephal* is properly ταπεινος, *humilis;* the addition of *ruach* is equivalent to τω πνευματι. Such an addition therefore as is made to the sense of ταπεινος in the one phrase by τω πνευματι, such also is made to the sense of πτωχος in the other by the same words superadded. It may be thought that no ad-

dition is made to the first, the simple term ταπεινος expressing a quality of the mind; but this is a mistake arising from the application of the Eng. word *humble*, which does not entirely coincide with the aforesaid terms in the ancient tongues. In all these the word properly refers to meanness of condition. In the few instances wherein ταπεινος signifies *humble*, and ταπεινωσις *humility*, there may be justly said to be an ellipsis, of τη καρδια or τω πνευματι. The proper word for *humble* is ταπεινοφρων, for *humility* ταπεινοφροσυνη. As therefore ταπεινοφρων, ταπεινος τη καρδια, and ταπεινος τω πνευματι (for this expression also occurs in the Sep. Pas. xxxiv. 18.), denote one whose mind is suited to the lowness of his station, so πτωχος τω πνευματι denotes one whose mind is suited to the poorness of his circumstances. As the former imports unambitious, unaspiring after worldly honours or the applause of men; the latter imports unrepining, not covetous of earthly treasure, easily satisfied, content with little. This and humility are indeed kindred virtues, but not the same.

Wet. is singular in thinking that the words ought to be construed thus: μακαριοι τω πνευματι—οι πτωχοι. He understands πνευμα to mean the spirit of God, and renders it into La. *Beati spiritui pauperes;* as if we should say, *Happy in the Spirit's account are the poor.* He urges that πτωχοι τω πνευματι is unexampled. But is it more so than μακαριοι τω πνευματι? Or do we find any thing in Scripture analagous to this phrase in the manner he has explained it? I have shown that there is at least one phrase, ταπεινος τω πνευματι, perfectly similar to the other, which may well serve to explain it, and remove his other objection, that it ought to mean a bad quality. Besides, I would ask, whether we are to understand in verse 8th, τη καρδια as likewise construed with μακαριοι? for nothing can be more similar than the expressions μακαριοι οι πτωχοι τω πνευματι and μακαριοι οι καθαροι τη καρδια.

5. *They shall inherit*, αυτοι κληρονομησουσι. Vul. *Ipsi possidebunt.* The La. word *possidebunt* sufficiently corresponds to the Gr. κληρονομησουσι: which generally denotes possessing by any title, by lot, succession, purchase, conquest, or gift; I therefore think that Cas. judged better in following the Vul. than Be. who expresses the sentiment by a circumlocution which appears too positively to exclude possession of every other kind. *Ipsi terram*

hæreditario jure obtinebunt. But as the speciality which the word sometimes conveys may be more simply expressed in Eng. I have with the common version preferred *inherit* to possess. It happily accords to the style of the N. T. in regard both to the present privileges and to the future prospects of God's people. They are here denominated *sons of God*; *and if sons*, as the Apostle argues, *then heirs, heirs of God, and co-heirs with Christ.* The future recompense is called *a birth-right, an inheritance.* Diss. XII. P. I. § 17.

[2] *The land, την γην.* E. T. *The earth.* That the word is susceptible of either sense cannot be doubted. The question is, which is the genuine sense in this passage? Let it be observed, that it had, long before then, become customary, amongst the most enlightened of the Jewish nation, to adopt the phraseology which the sacred writers had employed, in reference to ceremonial observances and temporal promises, and to affix to the words a more sublime meaning, as referring to moral qualities, and to eternal benefits. This might be illustrated, if necessary, from many passages of the N. T. as well as from the oldest Jewish writers. The expression under examination is an instance, being a quotation from Ps. xxxvii. 11. Now, in order to determine the sense of the word here, its meaning there should first be ascertained. Every person conversant in the Heb. knows that the word there used (and the same may be said of the Gr. and La. words by which it is rendered) sometimes means *the earth*, sometimes a particular *land* or country. Commonly the context, or some epithet, or the words in construction, remove the ambiguity. That, in the passage referred to, it signifies *the land*, namely Canaan, promised to the Patriarchs, is hardly called in question. As for *the earth*, it was given, says the Psalmist, to the children of men; even the idolatrous and profane were not excluded. Whereas this peculiar, this much favoured *land*, God reserved for the patrimony of Israel, whom he honoured with the title of *his son, his first-born.* To this, the ancient promises given to the Israelites had all a manifest reference. It is true, our translators have rendered the word, in the passage of the Psalms alluded to, *the earth*, merely, I imagine, that it might be conformable to what they understood to be the sense of the expression, in this place. A strong proof of this is that they have observed no uniformity, in their manner of translating

it, in this very Psalm. The word occurs six times. Thrice they translate it, *the land*, and thrice *the earth*. Yet there is not the shadow of a reason for this variation; for no two things can be more similar than the expressions so differently rendered. Thus, v. 11. *The meek shall inherit the earth;* v. 29. *The righteous shall inherit the land.* Indeed nothing can be plainer to one who reads this sacred ode with attention, than that it ought to be rendered *land*, throughout the whole. Peace, security, and plenty in *the land* which the Lord their God had given them, are the purport of all the promises it contains. 'But,' it may be said, 'admit this were the 'meaning of the Psalmist, are we to imagine that the evangelical pro-'mise given by our Lord, is to be confined, in the same manner, to the 'possession of the earthly Canaan?' By no means. Nevertheless our Lord's promise, as he manifestly intended, ought to be expressed, in the same terms. The new covenant which God hath made with us, by Jesus Christ, is founded on better promises than that which he made with the Israelites, by Moses. But then, the promises, as well as the other parts of the Mosaic covenant, are the figures or shadows, as the writer to the Hebrews well observes (ch. x. 1.), of the corresponding parts of the Christian covenant. Even the holy men under that dispensation were taught, by the Spirit, to use the same language, in regard to blessings infinitely superior to those to which the terms had been originally appropriated. David warns the people, in his time, of the danger of provoking God, to swear concerning them, as he had sworn concerning their fathers in the desert, that they should not enter into his rest. Yet the people were at that very time in possession of Canaan, the promised rest, and consequently could not be affected by the threat, in the ordinary acceptation of the words. Hence the aforecited author justly concludes (ch. iv. 9.), that the inspired penman must have had in his view another rest, which still remains for the people of God, and from which men's disobedience may still prove the cause of their exclusion. Moses had his *land* of promise, with the prospect of which he roused the Israelites. Jesus Christ also has his, with the hope of which he encourages and stimulates his disciples. That it is the heavenly happiness that is meant, appears to me certain (for all the promises here relate to things spiritual and eternal,) but still conveyed under those typical expressions to which his hearers had been habituated. The Rh. in Eng.

and L. Cl. in Fr. are the only translators into modern languages with whose versions I am acquainted, who have expressed this properly. L. Cl. says, *ils posséderont le pays.* At the same time his note on the place shows that he misunderstood the sense. He supposed this declaration to relate solely to those Jews converted to Christianity, who, after the destruction of Jerusalem, and the subversion of the Jewish polity, by the Romans, were allowed to live peaceably in the country, because they had taken no part in the war. These sentences with which our Lord's doctrine is introduced, are to be regarded not as particular predictions, but as universal axioms. All those who fall within the description, *the poor, the meek, the merciful,* in any age or country, are entitled to the promise. It is impossible that they should have been understood otherwise, at the time, by any hearer. The general tenor of the expressions used, unlimited by any circumstance of time or place, especially when compared with the scope and tendency of the whole discourse, shows manifestly that they are to be held as the fundamental principles of the new dispensation, to be introduced by the Messiah. Besides, all the other promises are confessedly such as suit the nature of the kingdom, which is declared by its founder and sovereign to be *not of this world.* How unreasonable is it then to think that this must be understood as an exception? Indeed some who render *την γην the earth,* acknowledge that heaven is meant. But how vague and arbitrary must this way of expounding appear, when we consider that *heaven* is in this very discourse contrasted to *earth,* and distinguished from it? That our Lord's style is often figurative is not to be denied. But the figures are not taken at random, nor to be interpreted by every body's fancy. They are adopted according to certain rules easily discoverable from an acquaintance with holy writ, and the Jewish laws and ceremonies. And of those rules, no one is more common than that which assigns a spiritual and sublime meaning, to expressions in the law, which relate merely to external rites, and temporal benefits. (See the N. on v. 8.) I shall only add, that all these promises are in effect the same, but presented under such different aspects as suit the different characters recommended. Thus *a kingdom* is promised to *the poor, consolation* to *the mourners, an inheritance* to *the meek,* who are liable here to be dispossessed of every thing, by the aspiring and the violent; and so of the rest.

4, 5. In the Vul. and the Cam. these verses are transposed. The Vul. is the only version, and the Cam. the only MS. where this arrangement is found.

6. *Who hunger and thirst for righteousness,* οἱ πεινωντες και διψωντες την δικαιοσυνην. In the ordinary interpretation *to hunger and thirst* denotes to have an ardent desire. Maldonate was of opinion that the words ought rather to be rendered *who hunger and thirst because of righteousness;* that is, whose righteousness or integrity has occasioned their being reduced to such a state of indigence. His reasons for this exposition are as follows: 1st, That they who are in the literal sense hungry and thirsty are here meant, there is reason to presume from the parallel passage in L. where the words are, *Ye who hunger now,* without the addition of righteousness, or any word corresponding to it. 2dly, Though *thirst* is by the sacred authors often used metaphorically for the desire of spiritual good things, there is not any clear example that *hunger* is ever so applied. 3dly, Each of these declarations, commonly called beatitudes, regards a particular virtue, and not a virtuous character in general. I acknowledge that the first is the only one of these reasons which appears to me to have any weight. As to the second, a single instance of a metaphorical application, when plain from the context, is sufficient evidence. Besides, though *hunger* simply is not used by metaphor for the desire of spiritual things, the spiritual things themselves are represented by *bread* and by *meat,* as well as by *drink* (Is. lv. 1, 2. J. vi. 27.); and our participation in them is represented by *eating* as well as by *drinking* (J. vi. 50. 1 Cor. v. 2.) *Hunger* here therefore, coupled with *thirst,* may be accounted sufficiently explicit for expressing strong desire of spiritual things, in like manner as *eating* coupled with *drinking* denotes an ample participation in them. In tropes so closely related, the sense of one ascertains the sense of the other. As to the third reason, though righteousness is used to denote the whole of practical religion, *to hunger and thirst for righteousness* may, not improperly, be said to express one particular quality only, to wit, a zeal for higher attainments in virtue and piety. The declaration in v. 10th, may, in one view, be considered as equally general with this, and in another, as regarding solely the virtue of perserverance or con-

stancy. But what principally weighs with me is, first, the consideration that the common interpretation appears to have been the universal interpretation of the earliest ages. This is a strong presumption that it is the most natural, and best suited to the construction. 2dly, The omission of the preposition *δια*, on Maldonate's hypothesis, is not at all suited to the style of these writers; but that *διψαω* is sometimes used actively, and governs the accusative of that which is the object of our thirst, we are authorized by Phavorinus to assert: *συνταττεται*, says that lexicographer, *αιτιατικη και γενικη, αιτιατικη μεν, ως το, εδιψησε σε ἡ ψυχη μου, και διψω τους λογους*. The former of these examples is quoted from Ps. lxii. 2. answering to lxiii. 1. in the English Bible, which follows the Masoretic Heb. *My soul thirsteth for thee.* The passage appears in the same form in Trommius' Concordance, on the verb *διψαω*. Yet in the common editions of the Sep. the pronoun is *σοι* not *σε*. But that the accusative is sometimes used as well as the dative and the genitive, is manifest from Wisd. xi. 14. *ουχ' ὁμοια δικαιοις διψησαντες*. Besides, the sense which Maldonate gives, is included in v. 10. and this I think a strong objection to it.

8. *The clean in heart, οι καθαροι τη καρδια.* E. T. *The pure in heart.* I admit that this is a just expression of the sense, and more in the Eng. idiom than mine. My only reason for preferring a more literal version of the word *καθαρος* here is, because I would, in all such instances, preserve the allusion to be found in the moral maxims of the N. T. to the ancient ritual, from which the metaphors of the sacred writers, and their other tropes are frequently borrowed, and to which they owe much of their lustre and energy. The laws in regard to the cleanness of the body, and even of the garments, if neglected by any person, excluded him from the temple. He was incapacitated for being so much as a spectator of the solemn service at the altar. The Jews considered the empyreal heaven as the architype of the temple of Jerusalem. In the latter, they enjoyed the symbols of God's presence, who spoke to them by his ministers; whereas, in the former, the blessed inhabitants have an immediate sense of the divine presence, and God speaks to them face to face. Our Lord, preserving the analogy between the two dispensations, intimates that *cleanness* will be as necessary in order to procure admission

into the celestial temple, as into the terrestrial. But at the privilege is inconceivably higher, the qualification is more important. The cleanness is not ceremonial, but moral; not of the outward man, but of the inward. The same idea is suggested, Ps. xxiv. When such allusions appear in the original, they ought, if possible, to have a place in the version.

9. *The peacemakers, οἱ εἰρηνοποιοι.* An. *the pacific;* Hey. *the peaceable.* Weakly both. With us these words imply merely a negative quality, and are equivalent to *not contentious, not quarrelsome, not litigious.* More is comprised here. This word is not found in any other part of Scripture, but (which is nearly the same) the verb *εἰρηνοποιεω* of the same origin occurs, Col. i. 20. where the connection shows that it cannot signify to be gentle, to be peaceable, but actively to reconcile, *to make peace.* Etymology and classical use also concur in affixing the sense of *reconciler, peacemaker,* to *εἰρηνοποιος.* It is likewise so explained by Chrysostom. Indeed, if no more were meant by it than those pacifically disposed, nothing additional, would be given here, to what is implied in the first and third of these characters; for as these exclude covetousness, ambition, anger, and pride, they remove all the sources of war, contention, and strife. Now, though all these characters given by our Lord are closely related, they are still distinct.

11. *Prosecute, διωξωσι.* E. T. *Persecute.* Some critics think, not improbably, that the word in this place relates to the prosecutions of the disciples (to whom Jesus here directly addresses himself) on account of their religion, before human tribunals whereof he often warned them on other occasions. In this verse, he descends to particulars, distinguishing *διωκειν* from *ονειδιζειν*, and *ειπειν παν πονηρον ρημα*, which seem also to be used in reference to judicial proceedings. In the preceding verse, and in the following, there can be no doubt that the verb is used in the utmost latitude, and ought to be rendered *persecute.* See also ch. x. 23. xxiii. 34.

15. *A lamp, λυχνον.* E. T. *A candle.* The meaning of the word is *lamp.* Candles were not used at that time in Judea for lighting their houses. *Λυχνια* consequently means a lamp-stand, not a candlestick.

[2] *Under a corn measure, ὁπο τον μοδιον.* E. T. *Under a bushel.* But they had no such measure. And though it is true that any measure of capacity will suit the observation, a translator ought not, even indirectly, to misrepresent the customs of the people. The measure mentioned by the Evangelist, so far from answering to our *bushel*, was less than our *peck*. But as nothing here depends on the capacity of the measure, it is better to adopt the general term, than to introduce uncouth names, without necessity. Diss. VIII. P. I. § 6.

[3] As to the article prefixed to *μοδιον* and *λυχνιαν*, Sc. says, "Ob- "serve how the article loses its emphasis, and is rendered *a* instead of "*the*." I admit that the article may be in some cases redundant, but not that we have an example of its redundancy here. Is it not our constant way, when we name any utensil whereof there is but one of the kind in the house, to use the definite article? "Bring "me *the* balance, that I may weigh this." "Take *the* bushel, and mete the grain." And even when there are more than one, if one be superior in value to the rest, or in more frequent use, it is commonly distinguished in the same manner. On the contrary, when there are more of a kind, and no one distinguished from the rest, we express ourselves indefinitely, as, "Give me *a* spoon:" "Set *a* "chair for Mr. Such-a one." Our Lord's similitude is taken from the customs of families. He therefore uses the style which would be used in any house. This explains sufficiently why he says *a lamp*, as probably most houses had more than one, but *the modius*, there being but one, and *the stand*, as one might be in more frequent use than the rest, for the accommodation of the family. However, as the sense is sufficiently expressed either way, I have preferred the indefinite manner in my version, being better adapted to the more general terms I was obliged to adopt. See N. on ch. xxvii. 61.

17. *To subvert the law or the prophets, καταλυσαι τον νομον η τους προφητας.* E. T. *To destroy.* Of the different senses which have been assigned to the verb *καταλυσαι*, one is, when applied to a law, *to break* or *violate*. Though this is the sense of the simple verb *λυω*, v. 19. it cannot be the sense of the compound here. Nobody could suppose that it needed a divine mission to qualify one to transgress the law, which so many, merely from the

depravity of their own minds, flagrantly did every day. Another sense which suits better the context, is authoritatively *to repeal* or *abrogate*. This appears proper as applied to the law, but harsh as applied to the prophets, though by the prophets are meant, by a common metonymy, the prophetical writings. But even these we never speak of abolishing or abrogating. *To destroy* is rather saying too much, and is more in the military style than in the legislative. If every copy and scrap of these writings were obliterated or burnt, we could not say more than that they were destroyed. The context, in my opinion, shows that the import of the word here is not directly to rescind or repeal, but indirectly to supersede a standing rule by the substitution of another; which, though it does not, formally, *annul* the preceding, may be said, in effect *to subvert* it. This appears fully to express the sense, and is equally adapted to both terms, the law and the prophets.

[2] *But to ratify*, αλλα πληρωσαι. E. T. *But to fulfil.* The sense of the verb πληροω is ascertained by καταλυω. We have seen that the meaning of this word cannot be *to break*, and therefore it is highly probable that the other means more than *to obey.* The proper opposite of weakening and subverting a law is *confirming* and *ratifying* it. See N. on ch. iii. 15. Some of great name translate it here *to complete*, perfect, or fill up, and think it alludes to the precepts, as it were, superadded in this discourse. I own there is a plausibility in this explanation; some of our Lord's precepts being, to appearance, improvements on the law. Yet I cannot help thinking, that these divine sayings are to be regarded rather as explanatory of the law, in showing its extent and spirituality, than as additions to it, not binding on men before, but deriving their power to oblige, purely from their promulgation by Jesus Christ. Besides, I find no example of the sense *to fill up* in any passage that can be reckoned analagous to the present. For the phrase *fill up the measure of your fathers* cannot surely be accounted of the number. The word *measure* there leaves no room to hesitate. It is otherwise here. The interpretation, *make fully known*, given by Benson (Essay concerning abolishing of the Ceremonial Law, ch. ii. sect. 2), though not implausible, does not make so exact a contrast to the preceding word *subvert*, nor is it, in this application, so well established by use.

18. *Verily I say unto you*, αμην λεγω υμιν. As Mt. has retained the Heb. word *amen*, in such affirmations, and is, in this, followed by the other Evangelists, though less frequently by L. than by the rest, it is not improper here, where the word first occurs, to inquire into its import. Its proper signification is *true, verus*, as spoken of things, *observant of truth, verax*, as spoken of persons, sometimes *truth* in the abstract. In the O. T. it is sometimes used adverbially, denoting a concurrence in any wish or prayer, and is rendered by the Seventy γενοιτο, *so be it*. In this application the word has been adopted into most European languages. In the N. T. it is frequently used in affirmation. Now as L. has been more sparing than the other Evangelists, in the use of this Oriental term, it is worth while to observe, when he is relating the same passages of our Lord's history with them, what word he has substituted for the *amen*, as this will show in what manner he understood the Heb. adverb. The same prediction which in Mt. xvi. 8. is ushered in by the words αμην λεγω υμιν is thus introduced, L. ix. 27. λεγω υμιν αληθως, which answers to *truly* or *verily* with us. Another example of this interpretation we find, on comparing Mr. xii. 43. with L. xxi. 3. The only other example, in passages entirely parallel, is Mt. xxiii. 36. and L. xi. 51. where the αμην of the former is, by the latter, rendered by the affirmative adverb ναι. I have not observed any passage in the O. T. wherein the word *amen* is used in affirming; and therefore I consider this idiom in the Gospel as more properly a Syriasm than a Hebraism. Indeed some derivatives from *amen* often occur in affirmation. Such as *amenah*, Gen. xx. 12. Jos. vii. 20. rendered in the Sep. αληθως. Such also is *amenam*, which occurs oftener, and is rendered αληθως, επ' αληθειας, εν αληθεια, or ουτως, exactly corresponding to the application made of αμην in the Gospels. This is a strong evidence of the import of this word, in the N. T. as the nature of the thing will admit. Nor does there appear the shadow of a reason for the opinion maintained by some critics that, when used thus, it is of the nature of an oath. It is true that to swear by the God of truth, *elohe-amen*, is mentioned (Is. lxv. 16.) as an oath; and so doubtless would it be to swear *by the God of knowledge*, or *by the God of power*. But does any body conclude hence, that the words knowledge and power, wheresoever found, or howsoever applied, include an oath? It has also been urged, that in the trial of

jealousy the woman is said to be charged with an oath of cursing (Num. v. 22.), when all that was required of her was so say, *amen, amen*, to the imprecation pronounced upon her by the priest in case she was guilty of the crime suspected. This was doubtless an imprecation and an oath, for *amen*, said in that manner, was equivalent to the repetition of the words spoken by the priest. Should the magistrate in an Eng. judicatory (where the oath administered to witnesses is still in the form of an imprecation) rehearse the words, concluding as usual, *so help you God*, and require of the witness only to say *amen*, it would be justly termed an oath, and an imprecation against himself, if he gave a false testimony. But does any man conclude hence that *amen* implies either oath or imprecation, when he subjoins it to prayers for health and safety? This character does not result from any single word, but from the scope and structure of the whole sentence.

Yet a critic of no less eminence than Father Si. after translating properly *αμην λεγω ὑμιν*, Mr. viii. 12. *je vous assure*, subjoins in a note, *autrement, je vous jure*. With how little reason this note is added, let the judicious reader determine. Our Lord often recurs to this solemn form of asseveration in this discourse upon the Mount, where he expressly forbids his disciples the use of oaths in their intercourse with one another. How would it have sounded from him to address them in this manner, 'Swear not in any form; but let your 'answer to what is asked be simply yes or no; for I swear to you, 'that whatever exceedeth these proceedeth from evil?' How would this suit the harmony which so eminently subsists between his precepts and example? In fact, his solemn manner was calculated to impress the hearers with a sense, not so much of the reality, as of the importance, of what was affirmed; the aim was more to rouse attention than enforce belief.

[2] *One iota, ιωτα ἑν.* E. T. *One jot.* I thought it better here, with most Itn. and Fr. translators, to retain the Gr. word than to employ a term which, if it have a meaning, hardly differs in meaning from the word *tittle* immediately following. This could be the less objected against, as our translators have oftener than once introduced the name of two other Gr. letters, *alpha* and *omega*, in the Apocalypse.

[3] *Without attaining its end, ἑως αν γενηται.* L. ii. 2. N.

19. *Violate, λυσῃ.* It is evident that the sense of the simple *λυω* is not here the same with that of the compound *καταλυω* in v. 17th. The verbs contrasted are different, *καταλυω* to *πληροω*, *λυω* to *ποιεω*. With regard to laws, the opposite to subverting is ratifying, to violating is practising. This is a further evidence that more is meant in v. 17th by *πληροω* than barely obeying. And of the sense I have given it, we have here an actual example. For what tends more to ratify a law than additional sanctions, with which it was not formerly enforced ?

[2] *Or, και.* E. T. *And.* This is one of the cases wherein the copulative has the force of a disjunctive. The conjunction does but save the repetition of a common clause, which belongs severally to the words coupled. This remark will be better understood by resolving the sentence into the parts, whereof it is an abridged expression. Whoever shall violate these commandments, shall be in no esteem in the reign of heaven ; and whoever shall teach others to violate them, shall be in no esteem, &c. Here the sense, with the aid of the copulative, is evidently the same with that expressed disjunctively in the version. One reason, beside the scope of the passage, for understanding the conjunction in this manner is because the verbs *λυσῃ* and *διδαξῃ* are separated in the original, each having its regimen. *Ὁς εαν ουν λυσῃ μιαν των εντολων—και διδαξῃ ουτω τους ανθρωπους.* Consequently the *και* is not to be understood disjunctively in the end of the verse, where the verbs are more intimately connected, *ὁς δ' αν ποιησῃ και διδαξῃ.*

[3] *Were it the least of these commandments, μιαν των εντολων τουτων ελαχιστων.* E. T. *One of these least commandments.* But if the commandments here mentioned were Christ's *least commandments*, what, it may be asked, were *the greatest* ? or, Why have we no examples of the greatest ? That this phrase is not to be understood, our translators themselves have shown by their way of rendering ch. xxv. 40. 45. The clause must therefore be explained as if arranged in this manner—*μιαν των ελαχιστων των εντολων τουτων*, the three last words being the regimen of the adjective, and not in concord with it.

[4] *Shall be in no esteem in the reign of heaven—shall be highly esteemed, ελαχιστος κληθησεται εν τη βασιλεια των ουρανων—ουτος μεγας κληθησεται.* E. T. *He shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven—he shall be called great.* To be called great and to be called little, for to be esteemed and to

be disesteemed is so obvious a metonymy of the effect for the cause, that it naturally suggests itself to every discerning reader. By rendering therefore *βασιλεια των ουρανων*, agreeably to its meaning in most places, *the reign of heaven*, that is, the Gospel dispensation, there is not the smallest difficulty in the passage. But if this phrase be rendered *the kingdom of heaven*, as referring to the state of the blessed, and if *he shall be called the least in that kingdom* mean, as some explain it, *he shall never be admitted into it*, a most unnatural figure of speech is introduced, whereof I do not recollect to have seen an example in any author, sacred or profane.

20. *Excel, περισσευση.* E. T. *Exceed.* The original word expresses a superiority either in quantity or in kind. The latter difference suits the context at least as well as the former.

21. *That it was said to the ancients, οτι ερρεθη τοις αρχαιοις.* E. T. *That it was said by them of old time.* Be. *Dictum fuisse a veteribus.* Be. was the first interpreter of the N. T. who made the ancients those by whom, and not those to whom, the sentences here quoted were spoken. These other La. versions, the Vul. Ar. Er. Zu. Cas. Cal. and Pisc. are all against him. Among the Protestant translators into modern tongues, Be. whose work was much in vogue with the reformed, had his imitators. Dio. in Itn. rendered it *che fu detto dagli antichi;* the G. F. *qu'il a été dit par les anciens.* So also the common Eng. But all the Eng. versions of an older date, even that executed at Geneva, say *to them of old time.* Lu. in like manner, in his Ger. translation says, zu den alten. I have a Protestant translation in Itn. and Fr. published by Giovan Luigi Paschale in 1555, the year before the first edition of Be.'s (the place not mentioned,) which renders it in the same way with all preceding translators, without exception, *a gli antichi,* and *aux anciens.* All the late translators, Fr. and Eng. have returned to the uniform sense of antiquity, rendering it *to*, not *by*, the ancients. For the meaning of a word or phrase, which frequently occurs in scripture, the first recourse ought to be to the sacred writers, especially the writer of the book where the passage occurs. Now the verb *ρεω* (and the same may be observed of its synonymas) in the passive voice, where the speaker or speakers are mentioned, has uniformly the speaker in the genitive case, preceded by the preposition *υπο* or

δια. And in no book does this occur oftener than in Mt. See ch.ii. 15. 17. 23. iii.13. iv. 14. viii. 17. xii. 17. xiii. 35. xxi. 4. xxiv. 15. xxvii. 9. xxii. 31. In this last we have an example both of those to whom, and of him by whom, the thing was said, the former in the dative, the latter in the genitive with the preposition *ὑπο*. When the persons spoken to are mentioned, they are invariably in the dative. Rom. ix. 12. 26. Gal. iii. 16. Apoc. vi. 11. ix. 4. With such a number of examples on one side (yet these are not all), and not one from Scripture on the opposite, I should think it very assuming in a translator, without the least necessity, to reject the exposition given by all who had preceded him. It has been pleaded that something like an example has been found in the construction of one or two other verbs, neither synonymous nor related in meaning. Thus *προς το θεαθηναι αυτοις* ch. vi. 1. means to be seen by them. *Θεαομαι* in Gr. answers to *videor* in La. And the argument would be equally strong in regard to La. to say, because *visum est illis* signifies *it appeared to them*, that is, *it was seen by them; dictum est illis* must also signify *it was said by them*. The authority of Herodotus (who wrote in a style somewhat resembling, but in a dialect exceedingly unlike, that of the N. T.), in regard to a word in frequent use in Scripture, appears to me of no conceivable weight in the question. Nor can any thing account for such a palpable violence done the sacred text, by a man's of Be.'s knowledge, but that he had too much of the polemic spirit (the epidemical disease of his time) to be in all respects a faithful translator. Diss. X. P. V. § 5.

21. 22. *Shall be obnoxious to, ενοχος εσται*. E. T. *shall be in danger of*. To be *in danger of* evil of any kind, is one thing, to be *obnoxious to it*, is another. The most innocent person may be in danger of death, it is the guilty only who are obnoxious to it. The interpretation here given is the only one which suits both the import of the Gr. word, and the scope of the passage.

22. *Unjustly, εικη*. This word is wanting in two MSS. one of them the Vat. of great antiquity. There is no word answering to it in the Vul. nor in the Eth. Sax. and Ara. versions, at least in the copies of the Ara. transcribed in the Polyglots, which Si. observes to have been corrected on the Vul. and which are consequently of no authority as evidences. Jerom rejected it, imagining it to be an interpolation of some transcriber desirous

to soften the rigour of the sentiment, and, in this opinion, was followed by Augustine. On the other hand, it is in all the other Gr. MSS. now extant. A corresponding word was in the Itc. or La. Vul. before Jerom. The same can be said of these ancient versions, the Sy. Go. Cop. Per. and the unsuspected edition of the Ara published by Erpenius. Chrysostom read as we do, and comments on the word εἰκῇ. The earliest Fathers, both Gr. and La. read it. This consent of the most ancient ecclesiastic writers, the two oldest versions, the Itc. and the Sy. the almost universal testimony of the present Gr. MSS. taken together, give ground to suspect that the exclusion of that adverb rests ultimately on the authority of Jerom, who must have thought this limitation not of a piece with the strain of the discourse. I was of the same opinion, for some time, and strongly inclinable to reject it; but, on maturer reflection, judged this too vague a principle to warrant any alteration which common sense, and the scope of the place, did not render necessary. Mr. Wes. rejects this adverb, because, in his opinion, it brings our Lord's instructions on this head, down to the Pharisaic model; for the Scribes and Pharisees, he says, would have condemned causeless anger as well as Jesus Christ. No doubt they would. They would have also condemned the indulgence of libidinous thoughts and looks. [See Lightfoot, Horæ Hebraicæ, &c. on v. 28.] But the difference consisted in this, the generality of the Scribes, at that time, considered such angry words, and impure looks, and thoughts, as being of little or no account, in themselves, and to be avoided solely, from motives of prudence. They might ensnare men into the perpetration of atrocious actions, the only evils which, by their doctrines, were transgressions of the law, and consequently, could expose them to the judgment of God. The great error which our Lord, in this chapter, so severely reprehends, is their disposition to consider the divine law, as extending merely to the criminal and overt acts expressly mentioned in it. From these acts, according to them, if a man abstained, he was, in the eye of the law, perfectly innocent, and nowise exposed to divine judgment. We are not, however, to suppose that this manner of treating the law of God was universal among them, though doubtless then very prevalent. The writings of Philo in that age, and some of their Rabbies since, sufficiently show that the Jews have always had some moralists among them, who, as well as some Christian casuists,

could refine on the precepts of their religion, by stretching them even to excess.

[2] *To the council, τω συνεδριω.* It might have been rendered *to the sanhedrim, συνεδριον* being the ordinary name given to that supreme judicatory. I accordingly call it so in those places of the history, where it is evident that no other could be meant. But as the term is general, and may be used of any senate or council, though very differently constituted from the Jewish, I thought it better here not to confine it. It is not improbable also, that there is an allusion in the word *κρισει, judgment*, to the smaller or city-councils, consisting of twenty-three judges.

[3] *Ρακα* and *μωρε.* Preface to this Gospel, § 25.

[4] *Γεενναν.* Diss. VI. P. II. § 1.

26. *Farthing.* Diss. VIII. P. I. § 10.

27. The words *τοις αρχαιοις* are not found in a great number of the most valuable MSS. and ancient versions, particularly the Sy. The Vul. indeed has them. Mill and Wetstein reject them.

28. *Another man's wife, γυναικα.* E. T. *A woman.* Er. *Uxorem alterius.* The word *γυνη* in Gr. like *femme* in Fr. signifies both *woman* and *wife.* The corresponding word in Heb. is liable to the same ambiguity. Commonly the distinction is made by some noun or pronoun, which appropriates the general name. But it is not in this way only that it is discovered to signify *wife.* Of the meaning here given and ascertained in the same way by the context, we have examples, Prov. vi. 32. Ecclus. xxvi. 7. Wet. has produced more instances; but in a case so evident these may suffice. If we translate *γυναικα* woman, we ought to render *εμοιχευσεν αυτην hath debauched her.* The Gr. word admits this latitude. Thus Lucian (Dial. Dor. et Thet.) says of Acrisius, when his daughter Danae, whom he had devoted to perpetual virginity, proved with child, *υπο τινος μεμοιχευσθαι οιηθεις αυτην, ab aliquo strupratam fuisse illam arbitratus.* But I prefer the other way, as by changing here the interpretation of the word *μοιχευω*, the intended contrast between our Lord's doctrine and that of the Jews is in a great measure lost.

[5] *In order to cherish impure desire, προς το επιθυμησαι αυτης.* E. T. *To lust after her.* Vul. Ar. Er. Zu. Cal. *Ad concupiscendum eam.* Pisc. *Ut eam concupiscat.* The Gr. preposition *προς* before an infinitive with the article clearly marks the intention,

not the effect. This all the La. versions also do. The expression, ch. vi. 1. *προς το θεαθηναι αυτοις*, here rendered *in order to be observed by them*, is perfectly similar, and is manifestly employed to express the intention from which the Pharisees act. *Προς το* means, therefore, *in order to, to the end that ;* whereas *ὡστε*, which we have ch. viii. 24. and L. v. 7. signifies *so as to, insomuch that*, and marks solely the effect. When an expression, with either of these prepositions, is rendered into Eng. simply by the infinitive, it may be doubted whether we are to understand it as expressing the intention or the effect, and whether we should supply before the sign of the infinitive the words *in order*, or *so as*. Hence it is evident, that the common version of this passage is not so explicit as the original.

29. *Insnare thee*, *σκανδαλιξει σε*. E. T. *Offend thee.* Vul. *Scandalizat te.* Nothing can be farther from expressing the sense of the Gr. term than the Eng. word *offend*, in any sense wherein it is used. Some render the expression *cause thee to offend.* This is much better, but does not give fully the sense, as it does not hint either what kind of offence is meant, or against whom committed. The translators from the Vul. have generally, after the example of that version, retained the original word. Sa. says, *Vous scandalize ;* Si. no better, *Vous est un sujet de scandale ;* the Rh. *Scandalize thee.* This I consider as no translation, because the words taken together convey no conceivable meaning. The common version is rather a mistranslation, because the meaning it conveys is not the sense of the original. The word *σκανδαλον* literally denotes any thing which causes our stumbling or falling, or is an obstacle in our way. It is used, by metaphor, for whatever proves the occasion of the commission of sin. The word *παγις*, snare, is another term, which is, in Scripture, also used metaphorically, to denote the same thing. Nay, so perfectly synonymous are these words in their figurative acceptation, that, in the Sep. the Heb. word, מוקש *mokesh*, answering to *παγις*, *laqueous*, *a snare*, is oftener translated by the Gr. word *σκανδαλον* than by *παγις*, or any other term whatever. Thus Josh. xxiii. 13. What is rendered in Eng. literally from the Heb. *They shall be snares and traps unto you*, is in the Septuagint, *εσονται υμιν εις παγιδας και εις σκανδαλα*. Jud. ii. 3. *Their Gods shall be a snare unto you* Οι θεοι αυτων, *εσονται υμιν εις σκαν-*

δαλον. viii. 27. *which thing became a snare unto Gideon,* εγενετο τω Γεδεων εις σκανδαλον. 1K.xviii. 21. *that she may be a snare to him,* και εσται αυτω εις σκανδαλον. Ps. Gr. cv. cvi. 36. *which were a snare unto them,* και εγεννηθη αυτοις εις σκανδαλον. The word σκωλου, which is equivalent, is also used by the Seventy, in translating the same Heb. word. From the above examples, which are not all that occur, it is manifest that, in the idiom of the synagogue, one common meaning of the word σκανδαλον is *snare;* and that, therefore, to render it so in scripture, where it suits the sense, is to translate, both according to the spirit of the writer, and according to the letter. The anonymous version uses the same word.

32. *Except for whoredom,* παρεκτος λογου πορνειας. E. T. *saving for the cause of fornication.* The term *fornication* is here improper. The Gr. word is not, as the Eng. confined to the commerce of a man and a woman who are both unmarried. It is justly defined by Parkhurst, "Any commerce of the sexes out of lawful marriage." To this meaning of the word πορνεια etymology points, as well as scriptural use. It is the translation of the Heb. word זנוּנים and זנוּת which are employed with equal latitude as one may soon be convinced, on consulting Trommius' Concordance. The word, indeed, when used figuratively, denotes *idolatry,* but the context manifestly shows that it is the proper, not the figurative sense that is here to be regarded. Though πορνεια may not be common in classical Gr. its meaning is so well ascertained by its frequent recurrence both in the Septuagint and in the N. T. that in my opinion, it is as little to be denominated *ambiguous,* as any word in the language.

37. *But let your yes be yes, your no no;* εστω δε ὁ λογος υμων ναι, ναι, ου ου. E. T. *But let your communication be yea yea, nay nay.* I take this and the three preceding verses to be quoted James v. 12. I suppose from memory, as conveying the sense, though with some difference of expression, μη ομνυετε μητε τον ουρανον, μητε την γην, μητε αλλον τινα ὁρκον· ητω δε ὑμων το ναι, ναι, και το ου, ου. It is but just that we avail ourselves of this passage of the disciple, to assist us in explaining the words of his Master. It was a proverbial manner among the Jews (see Wet.) of characterizing a man of strict probity and good faith, by saying his *yes is yes, and his no is no;* that is, you may depend

his word, as he declares, so it is, and as he promises, so he will do. Our Lord is, therefore, to be considered here, not as prescribing the precise terms wherein we are to affirm or deny, in which case it would have suited better the simplicity of his style, to say barely *ναι και ου*, without doubling the words; but as enjoining such an habitual and inflexible regard to truth, as would render swearing unnecessary. That this manner of converting these adverbs into nouns, is in the idiom of the sacred penmen, we have another instance, 2 Cor. i. 20. For all the promises of God in him are yea, and in him amen: *εν αυτω το ναι, και εν αυτω το αμην* that is, certain and infallible truths. It is indeed a common idiom of the Gr. tongue, to turn, by means of the article, any of the parts of speech into a noun. And, though there is no article in the passage under review, it deserves to be remarked that Chr. in his commentaries, writes it with the article, *το ναι, ναι· και το ου, ου·* as in the passage of James above quoted. Either he must have read thus in the copies then extant, or he must have thought the expression elliptical, and in this way supplied the ellipsis. Whichsoever of these be true, it shows that he understood the words in the manner above explained. Indeed they appear to have been always so undsrstood by the Gr. Fathers. Justin Martyr, in the second century, quotes the precept in the same manner, in his second apology, *εστω δε ὑμων το ναι· και το ου, ου.* And to shew that he had the same meaning, he introduces it with signifying, that Christ gave this injunction to the end that we might never swear, but always speak truth, *μη ομνυειν ολως, τ' αληθη δε λεγειν αει.* Now,in the way it is commonly interpreted, it has no relation to the speaking of truth; whereas the above explanation gives a more emphatical import to the sentence. Thus understood, it enjoins the rigid observance of truth as the sure method of superseding oaths, which are never used, in our mutual communications, without betraying a consciousness of some latent evil, a defect in veracity as well as in piety. In like manner Clemens Alexandrinus, in the beginning of the third century, Stromata, lib. v. quotes these words as our Lord's: *ὑμων το ναι· και το ου, ου.* The same also is done by Epiphanius in the fourth century lib. 1. contra Ossenos. Philo's sentiment on this subject (in his book *Περι των δεκα λογιων*) is both excellent in itself, and here very apposite. It is to this effect, that we ought never to swear, but to be so uniformly observant of truth in our conversation, that our word may always be regarded as an oath. *Καλλιστον, και βιωφελεστατον, και ὁμοιοτατον λογικη φυσει, το ανωμοτον, ούτως αληθε-*

νειν εφ' ἑκαστου δεδιδαγμενη, ὡς τους λογους ὁρκους ειναι νομιζεσθαι.

2 *Proceedeth from evil*, εκ του πονηρου εστιν. Some render it *cometh from the evil one*, supposing του πονηρου to be the genitive of ὁ πονηρος, *the evil one*, that is, *the devil*. But it is at least as probably the genitive of το πονηρον *evil* in the abstract, or whatever this epithet may be justly applied to. The same doubt has been raised in regard to that petition, in the Lord's prayer, *Deliver us from evil*, απο του πονηρου, or *from the evil one*. I consider it as a maxim in translating, that when a word is, in all respects, equally susceptible of two interpretations, one of which, as a genus, comprehends the other, always to prefer the more extensive. The *evil one* is comprehended under the general term *evil*. But in the phrase the *evil one*, the pravity of a man's own heart, or any kind of evil, Satan alone excepted, is not included. If we fail in the former way, the author's sense is still given, though less definitely. If we err in the other way, the author's sense is not given, but a different sense of our own. It has been affirmed that this adjective with the article ought always to be rendered *the evil one ;* but it is affirmed without foundation. Το αγαθον denotes *good* in the abstract, and το πονηρον evil. L. vi. 45. See also Rom. xii. 9. Nor are these the only places.

39. *Resist not the injurious*, μη αντιστηναι τω πονηρω. E. T. *Resist not evil.* It is plain here from what follows that τω πονηρω is the dative of ὁ πονηρος, not of το πονηρον. It is equally plain that by ὁ πονηρος is not meant here *the devil ;* for to that malignant spirit we do not find imputed in Scripture such injuries as smiting a man on the cheek, taking away his coat, or compelling him to attend him on a journey.

40. *Coat*, χιτωνα—*mantle*, ἱματιον. Diss. VIII. P. III. §. 1, 2.

42. *Him that would borrow from thee put not away*, τον θελοντα απο σου δανεισασθαι μη αποστραφης. E. T. *From him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away.* Of these two the former version is the closer, but there is little or no difference in the meaning. Either way rendered, the import is, *Do not reject his suit*

44. *Bless them who curse you.* This clause is wanting in the Vul. Sax. and Cop. versions, and in three MSS. of small account.

[3] *Arraign, επηρεαζοντων.* E. T. *Despitefully use.* Vul. *Calumniantibus.* This suits better the sense of the word 1 Pet. iii. 16. the only other place in Scripture (the parallel passage in L. excepted) where it occurs, *ὁ επηρεαζοντες ὑμων την αγαθην εν Χριστω αναστροφην*, which our translators render, *who falsely accuse your good conversation in Christ.* Elsner justly observes, that the word has frequently a forensic signification, for bringing a criminal charge against one. Its being followed by the verb *διωκω* makes it probable that it is used in that sense here. I have translated it *arraign*, because it suits the meaning of the word in the above quotation, and is equally adapted to the original in the juridical and in the common acceptation.

45. *That ye may be children of your Father in heaven ;* that is, that ye may show yourselves by a conformity of disposition to be his children.

[3] *Maketh his sun arise on bad and good, and sendeth rain on just and unjust, τον ἡλιον αυτου ανατελλει επι πονηρους και αγαθους, και βρεχει επι δικαιους και αδικους.* E. T. *Maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.* An indiscriminate distribution of favours to men of the most opposite characters is much better expressed, in the original, without the discriminative article, and without even repeating the preposition unnecessarily, than it is in our common version, where the distinction is marked by both with so much formality. Another example of this sort we have ch. xxii. 10. I am surprised that Sc. who, in general, more in the taste of the synagogue than of the church, is superstitiously literal, has, both here and elsewhere, paid so little regard to what concerns the article.

46. *The publicans, οι τελωναι. The tollgatherers*, a class of people much hated, not only from motives of interest, but from their being considered as tools employed by strangers and idolaters for enslaving their country. Besides, as they farmed the taxes, their very business laid them under strong temptations to oppress. Johnson observes that *publican*, in low language, means *a man that keeps a house of general entertainment.* This is a manifest corruption. The word has never this meaning in the gospel : neither is this ever the meaning of the Latin etymon.

47. *Your friends.* E. T. *Your brethren.* the reading of most MSS. and some of the oldest is *τους φιλους ὑμων*. Of ancient versions also, the second Sy. and the Go. have read thus. It is the reading of the edition of Alcala, and is favoured by Wet. and other critics. The sense, however, it must be owned, is little affected by the difference.

[2] *Wherein do ye excel? τι περισσον ποιειτε.* E. T. *What do ye more than others?* Our Lord had declared, v. 20. *Unless your righteousness excel, εαν μη περισσευση, the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall never enter the kingdom of heaven.* Now to that declaration there appears, in the question *τι περισσον ποιειτε*, a manifest reference, which in the common version, disappears entirely. I have endeavoured to preserve it by imitating the original, in recurring to the term formerly used. Our Lord's expostulation is rendered more energetical by the contrast. 'If ye do good to your friends only, your righteousness, which, I told you, must excel that of the Scribes and Pharisees, will not excel even that of the Publicans and Pagans.'

[3] *The Pagans.* The reading is *οι εθνικοι* in the Cam. and several other MSS. It is supported by a number of ancient versions, the Vul. Cop. second Sy. Eth. Ara. Sax. It was so read by Chr. and several of the Fathers. It is, besides, much in our Lord's manner, not to recur to the same denomination of persons, but to others in similar circumstances. Publicans, when exhibited in the Gospel, as of an opprobrious character, are commonly classed with sinners, with harlots, or, as in this place, with heathens. The Go. has both words, but in a different order, Pagans in the 46th verse, and Publicans in the 47th.

CHAP. VI.

1. *That ye perform not your religious duties, την ελεημοσυνην ὑμων μη ποιειν.* E. T. *That ye do not your alms.* Some MSS. have *δικαιοσυνην* instead of *ελεημοσυνην*. The Vul. has *justitiam vestram.* The Sy. and Sax. are to the same purpose. Some of the Fathers read so. I do not take *δικαιοσυνη* (which is probably the genuine reading) to be used here for *ελεημοσυνη*, and to mean *alms*, as mentioned in the next verse; but I conceive with Dod. this verse to be a common introduction to the three succeeding paragraphs, in

relation to alms, prayer, and fasting. This removes Wh.'s and Wet.'s principal objection to this reading, namely, that it is not likely the Evangelist would, in the following words, when naming alms, have thrice called them *ελεημοσυνη*, after introducing the mention of them by another name. As to Wet.'s objection to the hypothesis here adopted, that he does not find prayer and fasting ever called *δικαιοσυνη*, it is well answered by Bishop Pearce, that in our Lord's parable of the Pharisee and the Publican, propounded on purpose to rebuke the conceit which the Pharisees had of their own righteousness, mention is made of fasting and paying tithes, as coming under this denomination. Further, in ch. iii. 15. John's baptism, an ordinance in itself of a positive, not moral, nature, was comprehended under the same term. However, as the authorities for this departure from the common reading are not so numerous as those by which on most other occasions, I have been determined, it is proper to give the reasons which have inclined me to adopt this correction. It appears to be quite in our Lord's manner to introduce instructions regarding particular duties by some general sentiment or admonition, which is illustrated or exemplified in them all. In the preceding chapter, after the general warning, v. 20. *Unless your righteousness excel*, &c. there follows an illustration of the sentiment, in regard, 1st, to murder, next to adultery and divorce, 3dly, to swearing, and, 4thly, to retaliation and the love of our neighbour; the scope of every one of these being to enforce the doctrine with which he had prefaced those lessons. As, in the former chapter, he showed the extent of the divine law; in this, he shows that the virtue of the best performances may be annihilated by a vicious motive, such as vain glory. His general admonition on this head is illustrated in these particulars, alms, prayer, and fasting. Add to this, that if we retain the common reading, there is in v. 2. a tautology which is not in our Lord's manner. But if the first verse be understood as a general precept against ostentation in religion, the abstaining from the common methods of gratifying this humour, in the performance of a particular duty, is very suitably subjoined as a consequence.

2. *They have received their reward*, *απεχουσι τον μισθον αυτων*; that is, they have received that applause which they seek, and work for. Knatchbul and others think that the word *απεχω*

here means *hinder* or *prevent*. On this supposition the words may be rendered, *They preclude their reward*, to wit, the reward of virtue in heaven. But I do not find that in any other passage of the N. T. where the word occurs, this sense can properly be admitted. Wherever, in the Septuagint, the verb is used actively, the meaning is not to hinder, but to obtain. Were, therefore, the only classical authority that has been produced on the other side, as clear as it is doubtful, the ordinary version of the word, which is also that of the Vul. and Sy. and other ancient translations, is here, by all the rules of interpretation, entitled to the preference.

4. *Recompense thee.* In the common Gr. copies, after *αποδοσει σοι*, we read *εν τω φανερω ;* which our translators render *openly*. But these words are not found in some ancient and valuable MSS. were not received by several of the most eminent Fathers, nor have been admitted into the Vul. the Sax. or the Cop. versions. Wet. thinks that both Jerom and Augustine have been led to reject this expression, by an excessive deference to the opinion of Origen, who did not think it probable that our Lord, in dissuading his disciples from paying a regard to the judgment of men, would have introduced, as an incitement, that the reward should be in public, a circumstance which brought them back, as it were by another road, to have still a regard to the esteem of men. But from the words which Wet. quotes from Augustine, that appears not to have been this Father's reason for rejecting those words. His declared reason was, because the expression was not found in the Gr. MSS. That by Gr. MSS. he meant Jerom's La. version, is presumed by Wet. without evidence, and against probability. The same appears to have been Origen's reason for rejecting the words ; though he justly considered their containing something repugnant to the scope of the argument, as adding credibility to his verdict. And even this additional reason of Origen is, by the way, more feebly answered by Wet. than might have been expected : *Debebat*, says he, speaking of Origen, *distinguere gloriam quæ a Deo est, et gloriam quæ est ab hominibus. Illi studendum est, non huic.* But did not Wet. advert, that in the promise, *God shall reward thee openly*, both are contained, honour from God the rewarder, and honour from men the spectators, the most incredulous of whom must be convinced, by so glorious an award of the infallible judge ? Now, if the first ought

alone to be regarded, of what significance is it whether the reward, which God gives, shall be public or private? Er. and Ben. therefore, acted, not without reason, in rejecting these words. It appears to me most probable, that some transcriber, thinking it certain that the recompense here meant is that which will be given at the general judgment, and perceiving that *εν τω φανερω* made a good antithesis to *εν τω κρυπτω*, in the preceding clause, has added it by way of gloss on the margin, whence it has been brought into the text. This is probably the origin of some other interpolations. This remark should be extended to verses 6th and 18th. In regard to the last mentioned, the number of MSS. as well as of ancient versions which omit the *εν τω φανερω*, are so many, that Wet. himself has thought fit to reject it.

7. *Talk not idly μη βαττολογησητε.* E. T. *Use not vain repetitions.* This interpretation is rather too confined. *Vain repetitions* are doubtless included in the prohibition. But they are not all that is here prohibited. Every thing that may justly be called *words spoken at random, vain, idle* or *foolish,* may be considered as comprehended under the term *βαττολογειν.* The word *πολυλογια*, applied to the same fault in the latter part of the verse, is a further evidence of this.

10. *Thy reign come.* Diss. V. P. I.

11. *Our daily bread, τον αρτον ἡμων τον επιουσιον.* Vul. *Panem nostrum supersubstantialem.* Rhe. *Our supersubstantial bread.* The same word, *επιουσιον*, is however, in the parallel place in L. rendered in the Vulg. *quotidianum.* In this way it had been translated in both places in the Itc. with which agrees the Sax. version: *ἡ επιουσα, viz. ἡμεξα*, means literally the *coming day,* a phrase which, in the morning, may have been used for the day already commenced, and in the evening, for *to-morrow.* There is probably an allusion here to the provision of manna made for the Israelites in the desert, which was from day to day. Every day's portion was gathered in the morning, except the seventh day's. But in order to prevent the breach of the Sabbath, they received a double portion on the sixth day. That food, therefore, may literally be termed *ὁ αρτος αυτων ὁ επιουσιος.* This suits, in sense, the Sy. ממחר *demahur*, the word, according to Jerom, used in the Nazarean Gospel, which is accounted, by critics of great name, a genuine though not

faultless copy of Mt.'s original. See the Preface, § 13. In the M. G. version it is *καθημερινον*.

12. *Our debts*, *τα οφειληματα ἡμων*. That *sins* are meant, or *offences against God*, there can be no doubt. At first, therefore, for perspicuity's sake, I rendered the verse thus: *Forgive us our offences, as we forgive them who offend us.* But reflecting that the metaphor is plain in itself, and rendered familiar by scriptural use; reflecting also, that the remission of real *debts*, in many cases, as well as *injuries*, is a duty clearly deducible from our Lord's instructions, and may be intentionally included in the cause subjoined to the petition, I thought it better to retain the general terms of the common version.

13. *Abandon us not to temptation*, *μη εισενεγκης ἡμας εις πειρασμον*. E.T. *Lead us not into temptation.* The verb *εισφερειν*, in the Sept. is almost always used to express the Heb. verb בוא *to go*, in the conjugation *hiphil*, which, agreeably to the usual power of that conjugation, denotes, to cause to go, to bring, to lead. But though this be the usual, it is not the constant, import of that form of the verb. The *hiphil*, sometimes, instead of implying to cause to do, denotes no more than to permit, not to hinder. Nor need we be surprised at this, when we consider that, in all known languages, petitions and commands, things the most contrary in nature, are expressed by the same mood, the imperative. The words, *give me*, may either mark a request from my Maker, or an order to my servant. Yet so much, in most cases, do the attendant circumstances fix the sense, that little inconvenience arises from this latitude. In the N. T. there appear several examples of this extent of meaning in verbs, in analogy to the power of that conjugation. Mr. v. 12. *The devils besought him, saying, Send us, πεμψον ἡμας, into the swine.* Here the words, *send us*, mean no more than the words, *suffer us to go*, *επετρεψον ἡμιν απελθειν*, do in Mt. In this sense the word is used also in other places, as when God is said, 2 Thess. ii. 11. *to send strong delusions.* *Send away*, Gen. xxiv. 54. 56. 59. means no more than *let go.*

[a] *Preserve us from evil*, *ρυσαι ἡμας απο του πονηρου*. E.T. *Deliver us from evil.* The import of the word *deliver*, in such an application as this, is no more than to rescue from an evil into which one has already fallen; but the verb *ρυομαι*, which is frequently

used by the Seventy for a Heb. word signifying *to save*, or *preserve*, denotes here as evidently, keep us from falling into evil, as, deliver us from the evils into which we are fallen. See cv. 37. 2.

3 *Ὅτι σου ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεια, και ἡ δυναμις, και ἡ δοξα εις τους αιωνας. Αμην.* E.T. *For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen.* This doxology is wanting, not only in several ancient Gr. MSS. but in the Vul. Cop. Sax. and Ara. versions. It was not in the Gr. copies used by Origen, Gregory Nyssen, or Cyril. Cesarius quotes it, not as from the Scripture, but as from the liturgy used in the Gr. churches, whence, in all human probability, according to the judgment of the most celebrated critics, it has first been taken. I shall only add Wet.'s remark: "Si hæc "*δοξολγια* non pars est, sed appendix vel antiphona orationis dom- "inicæ, cui in ecclesia a sacerdote solo, et semper addi solebat, om- "nia plana sunt, et facile intelligimus, cur librarii illam Mattheo ad- "jecerint; sin autem ab ipso Domino fuit præscripta, qui factum, "ut ipso verba præeunte, nec omnes discipuli, nec Lucas Evangelis- "ta, nec Patres Græci, nec tota ecclesia Latina sequerentur? Porro "si quis rem ipsam pro pius consideraverit, deprehendet, utique "*δοξολογιαν* loco minus commodo hic inseri: apparet enim tum "comma 14. hoc modo nimis longe removeri a præcedente com- "mate 12. cujus tamen explicandi gratia, adjectum est," &c.

18. *To thy Father; and thy Father to whom, though he is unseen himself, nothing is secret, τω πατρι σου, τω εν τω κρυπτω και ὁ πατηρ σου ὁ βλεπων εν τω κρυπτω.* E.T. *Unto thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret.* It must be acknowledged that the expression, *which is in secret*, is rather dark and indefinite. If understood as denoting that every the most secret thing is known to God, the latter clause, *which seeth in secret*, is a mere tautology: but this cannot be admitted to have been the intention of the sacred writer; for the manner in which the clause is introduced, shows evidently, that something further was intended by it than to repeat in other words what had been said immediately before. On v. 6. there is indeed a different reading, two MSS. want the article *τω* after *πατρι σου*, which makes the secresy refer to the act of praying, not to the Father prayed to. In support of this reading, the Vul. and Ara. versions are also pleaded. But this authority is far too inconsiderable to warrant a change, not absolutely necessary, in point of meaning, or of construction. Besides, there

is no variation of reading on this 18th verse, either in versions or in MSS. Now the two passages are so perfectly parallel in their aim, and similar in their structure, that there is no ground to suppose a change in the one, which does not take place in the other. The unanimity, therefore, of the witnesses, that is, of the MSS. editions, and versions, which support the reading of v. 18th, is a strong confirmation of the common reading of v. 6th. But what then is to be understood by ὁ εν τω κρυπτω? I answer, with Gro. Wh. and others, that ὁ εν τω κρυπτω is here a periphrasis for ὁ κρυπτομενος, and signifies *hidden, unperceived, unseen.* The sentiment resembles that of the poet Philemon,

Ὁ πανθ' ὁρων τε κ'αυτος ουχ' ὁρωμενος;

who sees all things, and is unseen himself; or of the more ancient poet Orpheus, as quoted by Clement of Alexandria (*Admonit. ad Gentes,*)

ουδε τις αυτον
Ειδορα θνητων· αυτος δεγε παντας ὁραται.

To this purpose the words are rendered by Cas. *Patri tuo qui occultus est, et pater tuus qui occulta cernit.* Si. has understood this to be the meaning of the Vul. which says, *Qui est in abscondito,* as he translates it in this manner, *Votre pere qui ne paroit point; et votre pere qui voit ce qu'il y a de plus cache.*

19. *Treasure,* θησαυρους. I have here retained the word *treasure,* though not perfectly corresponding to the Gr. θησαυρος. With us, nothing is *treasure* but the precious metals. Here it denotes *stores* of all kinds. That *garments* were specially intended, the mention of *moths* plainly shows. It was customary for the opulent in Asiatic countries, where their fashions in dress were not fluctuating like ours, to have repositories full of rich and splendid apparel. However, as the sense here could not be mistaken, I thought energy of expression was to be preferred to strict propriety. For the same reason I have retained the common version of βρωθις *rust* (though the word be unusual in this meaning,) because it may denote any thing which corrodes, consumes, or spoils goods of any kind. Dod. says *canker.*

22. *Sound ἁπλους.* E. T. *Single.* Both Chr. and The. represent the Greek word as synonymous here with *ὑγιης*, *sanus.*

23. *Distempered, πονηρος.* E. T. *evil.* The *νοσωδης*, *morbidus.* That there is no reference to the primitive meaning of *ἁπλους*, *simple*, or *single*, is evident from its being contrasted to *πονηρος*, and not to *διπλους.*

[3] *How great will the darkness be? το σκοτος ποσον.* E. T. *How great is that darkness?* The words are rendered in the same way in all the Eng. versions I have seen, except those made from the Vul. which says, *Ipsæ tenebræ quantæ erunt?* From this the other La. translations do not materially differ; nor the Itn. of Dio. *Quante saranno le tenebræ?* nor the Fr. of P. R. Si. Sa. Beau. or L. Cl. who concur in rendering it, *Combien seront grandes les tenebres memes?* nor the Ger. of Lu. who says, wie groß wird denn die finsterniß selber ſeyn? The only foreign versions I have seen, which translate this passage in the same manner with the Eng. are the G. F. *Combien grandes seront icelles tenebres la?* and the Itn. and Fr. versions of Giovan Luigi Paschale. In the former of them it is, *Esse tenebre quanto sarranno grandi?* in the latter, *Combien grandes seront icelles tenebres?* Let it be observed, that there is nothing in the original answering to the pronoun *that*, which in this place mars the sense, instead of illustrating it. The concluding word *darkness*, it makes refer to *the eye*, whereas it certainly refers to *the body*, or all the other members as contradistinguished to the eye. Those who explain it of *the eye* represent our Saviour as saying, *If thine eye be dark, how dark is thine eye?* the meaning of which I have no conception of. In my apprehension, our Lord's argument stands thus: 'The eye is the 'lamp of the body; from it all the other members derive their light. 'Now if that which is the light of the body be darkened, how mise-'rable will be the state of the body? how great will be the dark-'ness of those members which have no light of their own, but de-'pend entirely on the eye?' And to show that this applies equally in the figurative or moral, as in the literal sense: 'If the conscience, 'that mental light which God has given to man for regulating his 'moral conduct, be itself vitiated; what will be the state of the appe-'tites and passions, which are naturally blind and precipitate?' Or, to take the thing in another view: 'You, my disciples, I have called 'the light of the world, because destined for instructers and guides

'to the rest of mankind; but if ye should come, through ignorance 'and absurd prejudices, to mistake evil for good, and good for evil, 'how dark and wretched will be the condition of those who depend 'on the instructions they receive from you, for their guidance and 'direction?'

24. *Mammon*, that is, *riches*. Mammon is a Sy. word, which the Evangelists have retained, as serving better to convey the energy of our Lord's expression. Wealth is here personified, and represented as a master who rivals God in our hearts. The word is become familiar enough to our ears to answer the same purpose.

25. *Be not anxious*, μη μεριμνατε. E. T. *Take no thought*. I do not think there is, in the common version, a more palpable deviation than this from the sense of the original. Paul says, Eph. v. 18. μη μεθυσκεσθε οινω, *Be not drunk with wine*. Should one translate this precept *Drink no wine*, the departure from the sense of the author would, in my opinion, be neither greater, nor more evident. Μεθη does not more clearly signify excess than μεριμνα does; the former in indulging a sensual gratification, the other in cherishing an inordinate concern about the things of this life. Paul has suggested the boundaries, in his admonition to the Philippians, iv. 6. *Be careful for nothing*, μηδεν μεριμνατε, *but in every thing by prayer and supplication, with thanksgiving, let your requests be made known unto God.*

Even here the phrase would have been better rendered, *Be anxious about nothing;* for doubtless we ought not to be careless about whatever is worthy to be the subject of a request to God. To *take no thought* about what concerns our own support, and the support of those who depend upon us, would inevitably prove the source of that improvidence and inaction, which are in the N. T. branded as criminal in a very high degree. See 1 Tim. v. 8. 2 Thess. iii. 8. There is not an apparent only, but a real, contradiction in the Apostle's sentiments to our Lord's precepts, as they appear in the common version, but not the shadow of a repugnancy to them, as expressed by the Evangelist. To be without anxiety, is most commonly the attendant of industry in our vocation, joined with an habitual trust in Providence, and acquiescence in its dispensations. The Vul. renders the words very properly, *Ne soliciti sitis*, and in this is followed by Er. Zu. Cal. Be. Pisc. and Cas. Ar. has adopted the

All these remarks arise from ignorance of th
at, that in old English to "take thought" is
e anxious". Though the expression may now be
odete, it was certainly not a forbidden de

barbarous word *anxiemini*, in preference to the classical *cogitetis* (as the latter does not reach the sense,) that he might express in one word in his version, what was expressed in one word in Gr. It is true, that in v. 27. the Vul. renders the word *μεριμνων*, *cogitans*. But one who considers the taste in which the greater part of that version is composed, can be at no loss to assign the reason of his changing the word. The translator, though not so extravagantly attached to the letter, as Arias and Pagnin, yet, was attached to it, even to excess; and having no participle from the same root with *solicitus*, to answer to *μεριμνων*, chose rather to change the word for a weaker, and say *cogitans*, than either to alter the participial form of the expression, or to adopt a barbarous term. The latter of these methods was afterwards taken by Ar. who said, *anxiatus;* the former, which was the better method, by the rest. Er. Zu. Pisc. and Be. say, *solicite cogitando*. Cal. *anxie curando*. Cas. *sua solicitudine*. No foreign version that I know, ancient or modern, agrees with the Eng. in this particular. As to the latter Eng. translations, suffice it to observe, that Wes.'s alone excepted, there is none of those I have seen, that does not use either *anxious* or *solicitous*. I have preferred the former, both as coming nearer the sense of the original, and as being in more familiar use. It may not be improper to observe, that Wy. has employed the term *over-solicitous*, which I think faulty in the other extreme. Solicitude, as I understand it, implies excess, and consequently some degree of distrust in Providence, and want of resignation. To say, *Be not over-solicitous*, is in effect to say, Ye may be solicitous, if ye do not carry your solicitude too far; a speech unbefitting both the speaker and the occasion. Dio. a very good translator, is perhaps reprehensible for the same error. *Non siate con ansieta sollecite*. We have, however, a most harmonious suffrage of translators, ancient and modern, against our common version in this instance. Some would say, that even Wes. might be included, who does not say, *Take no thought*, but *Take not thought;* for there is some difference between these expressions.

[2] *What ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink*, *τι φαγητε και τι πιητε*. The words, *και τι πιητε*, are wanting in two MSS. Likewise the Vul. Sax. and Eth. versions, have not this clause. But these are of no weight, compared with the evidence on the other side. It adds to this considerably, that when our Lord, in the

conclusion of his argument, v. 31st, expresses, for the last time, the precept he had been enforcing, both clauses are found in all the MSS. and versions.

[3] *Or*, *και*. This is one example in which the conjunction *και* is, with equal propriety, translated into Eng. *or*. When the sentence contains a prohibition of two different things, it often happens that either way will express the sense. When the copulative, *and*, is used, the verb is understood as repeated. Thus: Be not anxious what ye shall eat: and be not anxious what ye shall drink. When the disjunctive, *or*, is used, it expresses with us rather more strongly, that the whole force of the prohibition equally affects each of the things mentioned; as, *Be not anxious either what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink.* In the conjunction, *and*, in such cases, there is sometimes a slight ambiguity. Both the things mentioned may be prohibited, taken jointly, when it is not meant to prohibit them severally. Another instance of this kind, not perfectly similar, the critical reader will find, ch. vii. 6.

I shall here observe, by the way, that there are two extremes, to one or other of which most interpreters lean, in translating the instructions given by our Lord. Some endeavour to soften what to their taste is harsh; and seem afraid of speaking out to the world, what the sacred historian has authorized them to say. Others on the contrary, imagining that moral precepts cannot be too rigorous, give generally the severest and most unnatural interpretation to every word than can admit more than one, and sometimes even affix a meaning (whereof *μεριμνα* is an instance) for which they have no authority, sacred or profane. There is a danger on each side, against which a faithful interpreter ought to be equally guarded. Our Lord's precepts are in the Oriental manner, concisely and proverbially expressed; and we acknowledge, that all of them are not to be expounded by the moralist, strictly according to the letter. But whatever allowance may be made to the expositor or commentator, this is what the translator has no title to expect. The character just now given of our Lord's precepts, is their character in the original, as they were written by the inspired penmen for their contemporaries; it is the translator's business to give them to his readers, as much as possible, stamped with the same signature with which they were given by the Evangelists to theirs. Those methods, therefore,

of enervating the expression, to render the doctrine more palatable to us moderns, and better suited to the reigning sentiments and manners, are not to be approved. I have given an instance of this fault in Wy. and Dio. I shall add another from the pious Dod. v. 39. *Εγω δε λεγω ὑμιν, μη αντιστηναι τω πονηρω*, he renders thus: *But I say unto you, that you do not set yourselves against the injurious person.* In this he is followed by Wor. and Wa. The phrase, *do not set yourself against a man*, if it means any thing, means, *do not become his enemy*, or do not act the part of an enemy; a sense neither suited to the words, nor to the context. To pretend to support it from etymology, is no better than it would be to contend that *intelligo* should be translated, *I read between*, and *manumitto, I send with the hand;* or (to recur to our own language, which answers equally well) to explain *I understand*, as denoting *I stand under*, or *I reflect*, as implying *I bend back.* The attempt was the more futile here, as every one of the three following examples, whereby our Lord illustrated his precept, sufficiently shows that the meaning of *αντιστηναι* (had the word been equivocal, as it is not) could be nothing else than as it is commonly rendered, *resist*, or *oppose.* The anonymous translator 1729. seems likewise to have disrelished this precept, rendering it, *Don't return evil for evil;* a Christian precept doubtless, but not the precept of the text. Our Lord says expressly, and the whole context vouches his meaning, *Do not resist;* his translator will have him to say, *Do not resent.* Jesus manifestly warns us against opposing an injury offered; his interpreter will have him only to dissuade us from revenging an injury committed. Yet in the very interpretation which he gives of the following words, he has afforded an irrefragable evidence against himself, that it is of the former that Christ is speaking, and not of the latter.

But it must be owned, that there is danger also on the other side, to which our translators have, in rendering some passages evidently leaned. It is in vain to think to draw respect to a law, by straining it ever so little beyond what consistency and right reason will warrant. "Expect no good," says the Bishop of Meaux, "from those who overstrain virtue." *Ne croyez jamais rien de bon de ceux qui outrent la vertu.* Hist. des Variations, &c. liv. ii. ch. 60. Nothing can be better founded than this maxim, though it may justly surprise us to read it in that author, as

nothing can be more subversive of the whole fabric of monachism. There is not, however, a more effectual method, than by such immoderate stretches, of affording a shelter and apology for transgression. And when once the plea of impracticability is (though not avowedly, tacitly) admitted in some cases, it never fails to be gradually extended to other cases, and comes at last to undermine the authority of the whole. That this, to the great scandal of the Christian name, is become too much the way, in regard to our Lord's precepts, in all sects and denominations of Christians, is a truth too evident to admit a question.

27. *Prolong his life one hour.* L. xii. 25. N.

28. *Mark the lilies of the field. How do they grow? Καταμαθετε τα κρινα του αγρου πως αυξανει.* So it is commonly pointed in the printed editions. But in the old MSS. there is no pointing. Nor are the points to be considered as resting on any other than human authority, like the division into chapters and verses. I agree, therefore, with Palairet, who thinks that there should be a full stop after *αγρου*, and that the remaining words should be marked as an interrogation, thus, *Καταμαθετε τα κρινα του αγρου. Πως αυξανει;* This perfectly suits both the scope of the place, and the vivacity of our Lord's manner, through the whole discourse.

30. *The herbage, τον χορτον.* E. T. *The grass.* But lilies are not grass; neither is grass fit for heating an oven. That the lily is here included under the term *χορτος*, is (if there were no other) sufficient evidence, that more is meant by it than is signified with us by the term *grass*. I acknowledge, however, that the classical sense of the Gr. word is *grass*, or *hay*. It is a just remark of Gro. that the Hebrews ranked the whole vegetable system under two classes, עץ *ghets*, and עשב *ghesheb*. The first is rendered *ξυλον*, or *δενδρον*, *tree*; to express the second, the Seventy have adopted *χορτος*, as their common way was to translate one Heb. word by one Gr. word, though not quite proper, rather than by a circumlocution. It is accordingly used in their version Gen. i. 11. where the distinction first occurs, and in most other places. Nor is it with greater propriety rendered *grass* in Eng. than *χορτος* in Greek. The same division occurs Rev. viii. 7. where our translators have in like manner had recourse to the term *grass*. I have adopted, as coming nearer the meaning of the sa-

cred writer, the word *herbage*, which Johnson defines herbs collectively. Under the name *herb* is comprehended every sort of plant which has not, like trees and shrubs, a perennial stalk. That many, if not all sorts of shrubs, were included, by the Hebrews, under the denomination *tree*, is evident from Jotham's apologue of the trees chusing a king, Jud. ix. 7. where the *bramble* is mentioned as one.

[2] *Into the oven*, εις τον κλιβανον. Wes. *into the still.* But on what authority, sacred or profane, κλιβανος is made *a still*, he does not acquaint us. For my part, I have not seen a vestige of evidence in any ancient author, that the art of distillation was then known. The only objection of moment, against the common version of κλιβανος, is removed by the former part of this note. Indeed, the scarcity of fuel in those parts, both formerly and at present, fully accounts for their having recourse to withered herbs for heating their ovens. It accounts, also, for the frequent recourse of the sacred penmen to those similitudes, whereby things, found unfit for any nobler purpose, are represented as reserved for the fire. See Harmer's Observations, ch. iv. obs. vi. As to the words *to-day* and *to-morrow*, every body knows that this is a proverbial idiom, to denote that the transition is sudden.

[3] *O ye distrustful!* ολιγοπιστοι. E. T. *O ye of little faith!* It is quite in the genius of the Gr. language, to express, by such compound words, what in other languages is expressed by a more simple term. Nor do our translators, or indeed any translators, always judge it necessary to trace, in a periphrasis, the several parts of the composition. In a few cases, wherein a single word entirely adequate cannot be found, this method is proper, but not otherwise. I have seen no version which renders ολιγοψυχαι, *they of little soul*, or μακροθυμια, *length of mind*, or φιλονεικος, *a lover of quarrels.* How many are the words of this kind in the N. T. whose component parts no translator attempts to exhibit in his version? Such are, πλεονεξια, μεγαλοπρεπης, κληρονομεω, ειλικρινης, and many others. The word *distrustful* comes nearer the sense than the phrase *of little faith;* because this may express any kind of incredulity or scepticism; whereas anxiety about the things of life stands in direct opposition to an unshaken trust in the providence and promises of God.

33. *Seek—the righteousness required by him, ζητειτε—την δικαιοσυνην αυτου.* E. T. *Seek—his righteousness. The righteousness of God,* in our idiom, can mean only the justice or moral rectitude of the divine nature, which it were absurd in us to seek, it being, as all God's attributes are, inseparable from his essence. But in the Heb. idiom, that righteousness, which consists in a conformity to the declared will of God, is called *his righteousness.* In this way the phrase is used by Paul, Rom. iii. 21, 22. x. 3. where *the righteousness of God* is opposed by the Apostle to that of the unconverted Jews; and *their own righteousness,* which he tells us they went about to establish, does not appear to signify their personal righteousness, any more than the righteousness of God signifies his personal righteousness. The word *righteousness,* as I conceive, denotes there what we should call a system of morality, or righteousness, which he denominates their own, because fabricated by themselves, founded partly on the letter of the law, partly on tradition, and consisting mostly in ceremonies, and mere externals. This creature of their own imaginations they had cherished, to the neglect of that purer scheme of morality which was truly of God, which they might have learnt, even formerly, from the law and the Prophets properly understood, but now, more explicitly, from the doctrine of Christ. That the phrase, *the righteousness of God,* in the sense I have given, was not unknown to the O. T. writers, appears from Micah vi. What is called, v. 5. *the righteousness of the Lord,* which God wanted that the people should know, is explained, v. 8. to be *what the Lord requireth* of them, namely, *to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with their God.* It is in this sense we ought to understand the phrase, James i. 20. *The wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God;* that is, is not the proper means of producing that righteousness which God requireth of us. Now, *the righteousness of God,* meant in this discourse by our Lord, is doubtless what he had been explaining to them, and contrasting to *the righteousnss of the Scribes and Pharisees.* The phrase, *seeking righteousness,* for seeking to attain a conformity to the will of God, is not unsuitable to the Jewish phraseology. The same expression occurs, 1 Macc. ii. 29. *Then many that sought after justice and judgment, ζητουντες δικαιοσυνην και κρισιν, went down into the wilderness to dwell there.* And though this book is not admitted by Pro-

testants into the canon, it is acknowledged to have been written by a Jew, and entirely in the idiom of his country, if not originally in their language.

CHAPTER VII.

3. *The thorn*, *την δοκον*. E. T. *The beam.* That the tropes employed by the Orientals often appear to Europeans rather too bold and hyperbolical, is beyond a doubt. But I cannot help thinking, that the effect has been, in many cases, heightened by translators, who, when a word admits different interpretations, seem sometimes to have preferred that which is worst suited to the figurative application. The Gr. word *δοκος* has, even in classical use, more latitude of signification than the Eng. term *beam.* It answers not only to the La. *trabs* or *tignum*, a *beam* or *rafter*, but also to *lancea*, *hasta*, a *spear* or *lance.* In the latter signification, when used figuratively, I take it to have been nearly synonymous to *σκολοψ*, which, from denoting *palus aculeatus*, *sudes*, *vallus*, seems, at least in the use of Hellenists, to have been employed to denote any thing sharp-pointed (however little), as *a prickle*, or *thorn.* Thus, in Num. xxxiii. 55. *σκολοπες εν τοις οφθαλμοις ὑμων.* E. T. *pricks in your eyes ;* the Heb. term, to which *σκολοπες* answers, means no more than the Eng. makes it. The Gr. word is similarly rendered in the N. T. *εδοθη μοι σκολοψ εν σαρκι ; there was given to me a thorn in the flesh.* The like may be remarked of *βολις*, answering to the La. words *jaculum*, *sagitta*, and to the Eng. *missile weapon*, of whatever kind, *javelin*, *dart*, or *arrow.* But in the Hellenistic use, it sometimes corresponds to Heb. words, denoting no more than *prickle*, or *thorn.* Thus in Jos. xxiii. 13. *εις βολιδας εν τοις οφθαλμοις ὑμων* ; E. T. *thorns in your eyes*, the word *βολις* is put for a Heb. term which strictly means *thorn.* It is therefore evident that *δοκος* is used here by the same trope, and in the same meaning with *σκολοψ* and *βολις* in the places above quoted. And it is not more remote from our idiom to speak of *a pole* or *a javelin* than to speak of a *beam* in the eye. Nor is a greater liberty taken in rendering *δοκος thorn*, than in rendering *βολις* or *σκολοψ* in that manner.

6. *Or*, *και*. This is one of the cases wherein *και* is better rendered *or* in our language than *and.* The two evils mentioned are

not ascribed to both sorts of animals; the latter is doubtless applied to the *dogs*, the former to the *swine*. The conjunction *and* would here, therefore, be equivocal. Though the words are not in the natural order, the sense cannot be mistaken.

8. *For whosoever asketh obtaineth; whosoever seeketh findeth.* Diss. XII. P. I. § 29.

9. *Who amongst you men, τις εστιν εξ υμων ανθρωπος.* E.T. *What man is there of you.* There is evidently an emphasis in the word *ανθρωπος*, otherwise it is superfluous; for *τις εστιν εξ υμων* is all that is necessary; its situation at the end of the clause is another proof of the same thing. The word *ανθρωπος* here makes the intended illustration of the goodness of the celestial Father, from the conduct of even human fathers, with all their imperfections much more energetic. I think this not sufficiently marked in the common version; for *what man* is hardly any more than a translation of *τις*.

14. *How strait is the gate.* In the common Gr. we read, *ὁτι στενη ἡ πυλη.* But in a very great number of MSS. some of them of great antiquity, the reading is *τι* not *ὁτι*. This reading is confirmed by the Vul. *Quam angusta porta*, and by most of the ancient versions, particularly by the old Itc. both the Sy. the Ara. the Cop. the Go. and the Sax. It was so read by Chr. The. and the most eminent Fathers, Gr. and La. and is received by Wet. and some of the best modern critics.

15. *False teachers, ψευδοπροφητων.* E. T. *False prophets.* But *προφητης* not only means a prophet, in our sense of the word, one divinely inspired, and able to foretel future events, but also a teacher in divine things. When it is used in the plural with the article, and refers to those of former times, it always denotes the prophets in the strictest sense. On most other occasions it means simply a teacher of religious truths, and consequently *ψευδοπροφητης* a false teacher in religion. This is especially to be regarded as the sense, in a warning which was to serve for the instruction of his disciples in every age. I have, for the same reason, translated *προεφητευσαμεν*, v. 22. *taught;* which, notwithstanding its connection with things really miraculous, is better rendered thus in this passage, because to promote the knowledge of the Gospel is a matter of higher consequence, and would therefore seem more to recommend men than to foretel things future.

[2] *In the garb of sheep, εν ενδυματι προβατων.* Si. renders it, *Couverts de peaux de brebis*, and says in a note, "It is thus we "ought to translate *indumentis ovium*, because the prophets were "clothed with *sheep-skins*." It is true the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, xi. 37. in enumerating the great things which have been done and suffered, through faith, by prophets, and other righteous persons, mentions this, that they wandered about in *sheep-skins* and *goat-skins*, *μηλωταις και αιγειοις δερμασιν*, *being destitute, afflicted, tormented*, alluding to the persecutions to which many of them were exposed from idolatrous princes. That Elijah was habited in this manner, appears from 2 Ki. i. 7, 8. compared with ch. ii. 13. and 1 Ki. xix. 13. in which two last places, the word rendered in Eng. *mantle*, is, in the Sep. translated *μηλωτη*. But I have not seen any reason to think that this was the cemmon attire of the prophets. The first of the three passages serves as evidence, rather of the contrary, inasmuch as Elijah seems to have been distinguished by his dress, not only from other men, but from other prophets. That some indeed came afterwards hypocritically to affect a similar garb, in order to deceive the simple, is more than probable, from Zech. xiii. 4. But, whatever be in this, as *ενδυμα* does not signify a skin, there is no reason for making the expression in the translation more limited than in the original.

17. *Evil tree, σαπρον δενδρον.* E. T. *Corrupt tree.* The word *σαπρος* does not always mean *rotten* or *corrupted*, but is often used as synonymous to *πονηρος*, *evil.* Trees of a bad kind produce bad fruit, but not in consequence of any rottenness or corruption. See ch. xiii. 48, where, in the similitude of the net, which enclosed fishes of every kind, the worthless, which were thrown away, are called *τα σαπρα*, rendered in the common version *the bad.* Nothing can be plainer than that this epithet does not denote that those fishes were *putrid*, but solely that they were of a noxious or poisonous quality, and consequently *useless.*

23. *I never knew you ;* that is, *I never acknowledged you for mine.*

[2] *Ye who practise iniquity, οι εργαζομενοι την ανομιαν.* Be. *Qui operam datis iniquitati.* Diss. X. P. V. § 12.

28. *At his manner of teaching*, επι τη διδαχη αυτου. E. T. *At his doctrine.* The word διδαχη denotes often *the doctrine* taught, sometimes *the act* of teaching, and sometimes even *the manner* of teaching. That this is the import of the expression here, is evident from the verse immediately following.

29. *As the Scribes.* The Vul. Sy. Sax. and Arm. versions, with one MS. add, *and the Pharisees.*

CHAPTER VIII.

4. The Sy. says, *the priests*, but in this reading is singular.

2 *For notifying the cure to the people*, εις μαρτυριον αυτοις. E. T. *For a testimony unto them.* Both the sense and the connection show that the *them* here means *the people.* It could not be *the priests*, for it was only one priest (to wit, *the priest* then entrusted with that business) to whom he was commanded to go. Besides, the oblation could not serve as an evidence to the priest. On the contrary, it was necessary that he should have ocular evidence by an accurate inspection in private, before the man was admitted into the temple and allowed to make the oblation; but his obtaining this permission, and the solemn ceremony consequent upon it, was the public testimony of the priest, the only legal judge, to the people, that the man's uncleanness was removed. This was a matter of the utmost consequence to the man, and of some consequence to them. Till such testimony was given, he lived in a most uncomfortable seclusion from society. No man durst, under pain of being also secluded, admit him into his house, eat with him, or so much as touch him. The antecedent therefore to the pronoun *them*, though not expressed, is easily supplied by the sense. To me it is equally clear, that the only thing meant to be attested by the oblation was the cure. The suppositions of some commentators on this subject are quite extravagant. Nothing can be more evident than that the person now cleansed was not permitted to give any testimony to the priest, or to any other, concerning the manner of his cure, or the person by whom it had been performed. Ὁρα μηδενι ειπης, *See thou tell nobody.* The prohibition is expressed by the Evangelist Mr. in still stronger terms. Prohibitions of this kind were often transgressed by those who received them; but that is not a good reason for representing our Lord as giving contradictory orders.

6. *Afflicted*, βασανιζομενος. E. T. *Tormented.* The Greek word is not confined, especially in the Hellenistic idiom, to this signification, but often denotes simply (as has been observed by Gro. and Ham.) *afflicted*, or *distressed.* Palsies are not attended with torment.

13. *That instant*, εν τη ωρα εκεινη. E. T. *In the self-same hour.* But ωρα does not always mean *hour.* This is indeed the meaning when it is joined with a number, whether ordinal or cardinal; as, He went out about *the third hour*, and, Are there not *twelve hours* in the day? On other occasions it more commonly denotes the precise time, as, *Mine hour is not yet come.*

15. *Him.* The common Gr. copies have αυτοις *them.* But the reading is αυτω in a great number of MSS. several of them ancient; it is supported also by some of the old versions and fathers, is approved by Mill and Wet. and is more agreeable than the other to the words in construction, none but Jesus having been mentioned in the preceding words.

17. *Verifying the saying of the prophet.* We have here a remarkable example of the latitude in which the word πληροω is used. Ch. i. 22. N. In our sense of the term *fulfilling*, we should rather call that the *fulfilment* of this prophecy, which is mentioned 1 Pet. iv. 24. I have, in translating the quotation, rendered εκαβε *carried off*, of which the original Heb. as well as the Gr. is capable, that the words, as far as propriety admits, may be conformable to the application.

18. *To pass to the opposite shore.* Let it be remarked, once for all, that *passing* or *crossing* this lake or sea, does not always denote sailing from the east side to the west, or inversely; though the river Jordan, both above and below the lake, ran southwards. The lake was of such a form, that, without any impropriety, it might be said to be crossed in other directions, even by those who kept on the same side of the Jordan.

19. *Rabbi*, διδασκαλε. Diss. VII. P. II.

20. *Caverns*, φωλεους. The word φωλεος denotes *the den, cavern*, or *kennel*, which a wild beast, by constantly haunting it, appropriates to himself.

[2] *Places of shelter*, κατασκηνωσεις. E. T. *Nests.* But κατασκηνωσις signifies a place for shelter and repose, *a perch*, or *roost.*

The Gr. name for *nest*, or place for hatching, is *νοσσια*, which occurs often in this sense in the Sep. as *εννοσευω* does for *to build a nest*. But *κατασκηνωσις* is never so employed. The verb *κατασκηνοω* is used by the Evangelists Mt. Mr. and L. speaking of birds, to express their *taking shelter*, *perching*, or *roosting* on branches. In the common version it is rendered by the verb *to lodge*.

22. *Let the dead bury their dead.* This expression is evidently figurative; the word *dead* having one meaning in the beginning of the sentence, and another in the end. The import is, 'Let the *spiritually dead*, those who are no better than dead, 'being insensible to the concerns of the soul and eternity, employ 'themselves in burying those who, in the common acceptation of 'the word are *dead*.'

26. *Commanded, επετιμησε.* Mr. ix. 25. N.

28. *Gadarenes.* I agree with Wet. that *Gergesenes* appears to have been introduced by Origen upon mere conjecture. Origen's words imply as much. Before him most copies seem to have read *Gadarenes*, but some *Gerasenes*. The latter is the reading of the Vul. and of the second Sy. The former is preferable on many accounts, and is the reading of the first Sy. I shall only add, that if Origen's conjectural correction were to be admitted, it ought to be extended to the parallel places in Mr. and L.

[a] *Demoniacs.* Diss. VI. P. I. § 7, &c.

29. *What hast thou to do with us? τι ἡμιν και σοι.* E. T. *What have we to do with thee?* The sense of both expressions is the same. But the first is more in the form of expostulation. J. ii. 4. [a] N.

30. *At some distance, μακραν.* E. T. *A good way off.* Vul. *Non longé* probably from some copy which read *ου μακραν.* This is one of those differences wherein there is more the appearance of discrepancy than the reality. In such general ways of speaking, there is always a tacit comparison; and the same thing may be denominated *far*, or *not far*, according to the extent of ground with which, in our thoughts, we compare it. *At some distance* suits perfectly the sense of the Gr. word in this place, is conformable to the rendering given in the Sy. and makes no difference in the meaning from the La. The word *μακροθεν* (L. xviii.

13.) where it is said of the Publican μακροθεν ἑστως, must be understood in the same way. *Afar off*, as it is rendered in the E. T. sounds oddly in our ears, when we reflect that both the Pharisee and the Publican were in the outer court of the temple, on the same side of the court, and in sight of each other, at least, if not within hearing.

CHAPTER IX.

2. *Thy sins are forgiven thee*, αφεωνται σοι αι αμαρτιαι σου. E. T. *Thy sins be forgiven thee*. The words are an affirmation, not a prayer or wish. As a prayer, the Scribes would not have objected to them. At the time the common version was made, the words *be forgiven* were equivocal, they would now be improper. At that time *be* was often used in the indicative plural, for what we always say at present *are*. But even then, it would have been better, in this instance, to say *are*, which was also used, and would have totally removed the ambiguity.

3. *This man blasphemeth*. Diss. X. P. II. § 14.

5. *Thy sins are forgiven*, αφεωνται σοι αι αμαρτιαι. But there is a small difference of reading here. Many MSS. amongst which are some of principal note, have σου instead of σοι, a few have both pronouns. Agreeable to these last are the Vul. both the Sy. Ara. Eth. and Sax. I have followed, with Wet. that which seems best supported by number and antiquity.

[2] *Or to say* [*with effect,*] *Arise and walk*. The supply of the words in this clause, is, if not necessary, at least, convenient, for showing more clearly the scope of the sentiment. Merely to say, that is, to pronounce the words of either sentence, is, no doubt, equally easy to any one. And to say both with effect were equally easy to our Lord. Now, if the former only was said, *Thy sins are forgiven*, the effect was invisible, and for aught the people could know, there might be no effect at all. But to say to a man manifestly disabled by palsy, *Arise and walk*, when instantly the man, in the sight of all present, arises and walks, is an ocular demonstration of the power with which the order was accompanied, and therefore was entirely fit for serving as evidence, that the other expression he had used, was not vain words, but attended with the like divine energy, though from its nature, not discoverable like the other, by its consequences. To say the one with effect whose effect was visible is

a proof, that the other was said also with effect, though the effect itself was invisible. This is the use which our Lord makes of this cure, v. 6. *But that ye may know*, &c.

8. *Wondered*, εθαυμασαν. Vul. *Timuerunt.* This doubtless arises from a different reading. Accordingly εφοβηθησαν is found in three or four MSS. agreeable to which are also the Sy. the Go. the Sax. and the Cop. versions. The common reading not only has the advantage in point of evidence, but is more clearly connected with the context. ε

9. *At the toll-office*, επι το τελωνιον. E. T. *At the receipt of custom.* But the word *receipt* in this sense seems now to be obsolete. Some late translators say *at the custom-house.* But have we any reason to think it was a house? The Sy. name is no evidence that it was; for, like the Hebrews, they use the word *beth*, especially in composition, with great latitude of signification. Most probably it was a temporary stall or moveable booth, which could easily be erected in any place where occasion required. The name *tollbooth*, which Ham. seems to have preferred, would at present be very unsuitable, as that word, however well adapted in point of etymology, is now confined to the meaning of *jail* or *prison.* The word *office*, for a place where any particular business is transacted, whether within doors or without, is surely unexceptionable.

10. *At table.* Diss. VIII. P. III. § 3—7.

13. *I require humanity*, ελεον θελω. E. T. *I will have mercy.* But this last expression in Eng. means properly, *I will exercise mercy.* In the prophet here referred to, our translators had rendered the verb much better, *I desired.* They ought not to have changed the word here.

[a] *Humanity.* E. T. *Mercy.* The Gr. word commonly answers, and particularly in this passage, to a Heb. term of more extensive signification than *mercy*, which, in strictness, denotes only clemency to the guilty and the miserable. This sense (though Phavorinus thinks otherwise) is included in ελεος, which is sometimes properly translated *mercy*, but it is not all that is included. And in an aphorism, like that quoted in the text, it is better to interpret the word in its full latitude. The Heb. term employed by the prophet

Hosea, in the place quoted, is חסד *chesed*, a general name for all the kind affections. See D. VI. P. IV. § 18.

[3] *And not sacrifice*, for *more than sacrifice*, a noted Hebraism.

[4] *To reformation*, εις μετανοιαν. These words are wanting in a good many MSS. There is nothing to correspond to them in the Vul. Sy. Go. Sax. and Eth. versions. Critics are divided about them. To me there scarcely appears sufficient evidence for rejecting them. Besides, it is allowed by all, that if they be not expressed in this place, they are understood.

15. *Bridemen.* Mr. ii. 19. N.

16. *Undressed cloth*, ρακος αγναφον. E. T. *New cloth.* That this gives in effect the same sense cannot be doubted, as it answers literally to the expression used by L. who says ἱματιου καινου But as the expressions are different, and not even synonymous; I thought it better to allow each Evangelist to express himself in his own manner.

17. *Old leathern bottles*, ασκους παλαιους. E. T. *Old bottles.* Ασκος is properly a vessel for holding liquor. Such vessels were commonly then, and in some countries are still, of leather, which were not easily distended when old, and were consequently more ready to burst by the fermentation of the liquor. As this does not hold in regard to the bottles used by us, I thought it better, in translating, to add a word denoting the materials of which their vessels were made.

18. *Is by this time dead*, αρτι ετελευτησεν. E. T. *Is even now dead.* Philostrat. αρτι, περι τον καιρον των ρηματων. *By this time dead*, a natural conjecture concerning one whom he had left a-dying. As the words are evidently susceptible of this interpretation, candour requires that it be preferred, being the most conformable to the accounts of this miracle given by the other historians.

20. *The tuft of his mantle*, του κρασπεδου του ἱματιου αυτου. E. T. *The hem of his garment.* The Jewish mantle, or upper garment, was considered as consisting of four quarters, called in the Oriental idiom *wings*, πτερυγια. Every wing contained one corner, whereat was suspended *a tuft* of threads or strings, which they called κρασπεδον. See Num. xv. 37. Deut. xxii. 12. What are there called *fringes* are those *strings*, and the four quarters of the vesture are the four *corners*. In the Sy. version the word is

rendered קרנא, *karna, corner.* As in the first of the passages above referred to, they are mentioned as serving to make them remember the commandments of the Lord to do them, there was conceived to be a special sacredness in them (see ch. xxiii. 5.), which must have probably led the woman to think of touching that part of his garment rather than any other. They are not properly, says Lamy, *des franges* in our language, but *des houpes.* See his description of them and of the phylacteries, Commentarius in Harmoniam, lib. v. cap. xi. Sc. has rendered it in this place *fringe ;* but this word answers worse than *hem,* for their garments had no *fringes.*

27. *Son of David.* This was probably meant as acknowledging him to be the Messiah; for at this time it appears to have been universally understood that the Messiah would be a descendant of David.

30. *Their eyes were opened.* A Heb. idiom, neither remote nor inelegant, to denote, *They received their sight.*

[2] *Strictly charging them, said* ενεβριμησατο αυτοις λεγων. Vul. *Comminatus est illis, dicens.* Si. who translates from the Vul. says, *Leur dit, en les menaçant rudement ;* where, instead of softening the harsh words of his author, the La. translator, he has rendered them still harsher. In another place, Mr. i. 43. εμβριμησαμενος αυτω λεγει is thus expressed in his translation, *en lui disant avec de fortes menaces.* It is strange that, when the very words used by our Lord, on both these occasions, are related by the Evangelist, in which there is nothing of either threat or harshness, an interpreter should imagine that this is implied in the verb. Si. may use for his apology that he translates from the Vul. The Sy. translator, who understood better the Oriental idiom, renders the Gr. verb by a word in Sy. which implies simply *he forbade, he prohibited.* Mr. ix. 25. N.

35. *Among the people,* εν τω λαω. This clause is wanting in many MSS. in the Vul. the Sy. and most other ancient versions. As in this case the evidence on the opposite sides may be said to balance each other, and as the admission or the rejection makes no alteration in the sense ; that the clause possesses a place in the common Gr. editions, and in the E. T. is here sufficient ground for deciding in its favour.

36. *He had compassion upon them,* εσπλαγχνισθη περι αυτων. E. T. *He was moved with compassion on them.* Vul. *Misertus*

est eis. Be. imagining there was something particularly expressive in the Greek verb here used, has rendered this clause *commiseratione intima commotus est super eis*, and is followed by Pisc. Er. seems to have had in some degree the same notion. He says, *Affectu misericordiæ, tactus est erga illos*, and is followed by Cal. Leo de Juda adds only *intimé* to *misertus est.* Cas. has preferred the unaffected simplicity of the Vul. and said *misertus est eorum.* Lu. has taken the same method. Be.'s opinion had great weight with the Protestant translators of that age who came after him. Dio. says, *Sene mosse a gran pieta.* G. F. *Il fut esmeu de compassion envers icelles*, which is literally the same with our common version, and which has also been adopted by L. Cl. The P. R. translators, *Ses entrailles furent emues de compassion.* Sa. after the Vul. says simply, *Il en eut compassion.* Si. to the same purpose, *Il en eut pitié.* So does Beau. who translates from the Gr. Of the late Eng. translations, An. Dod. Wor. and Wa. follow the common version. Wes. has chosen to go beyond it, *He was moved with tender compassion for them.* But Wy. has in this way outstript them all, *His bowels yearned with compassion on them.* Sc. and Hey. render the expression as I do. Those strange efforts to say something extraordinary result from an opinion founded on etymology, of the signification of the Gr. word σπλαγχνιζομαι from σπλαγχνα, *viscera, the bowels.* This they consider as corresponding to the Heb. רחם *richam*, both noun and verb. The noun in the plural is sometimes interpreted, σπλαγχνα. The verb is never by the Seventy rendered σπλαγχνιζομαι, a word which does not occur in that version, but generally ελεεω or οικτειρω, which occur often, and are rendered *I have compassion, I have mercy*, or *I have pity.* Nay, the Heb. word frequently occurs joined with a negative particle, manifestly denoting to have no mercy, &c. Now for this purpose the verb *richam* would be totally unfit, if it signified to be affected with an uncommon degree of compassion; all that would be then implied in it, when joined with a negative, would be, that an uncommon degree of compassion was not shown. In the historical part of the N. T. where the word σπλαγχνιζομαι occurs pretty often, and always in the same sense, not one of those interpreters who in this passage find it so wonderfully emphatical, judge it proper always to adhere to their method of rendering adopted here, but render it barely *I have compassion.* Even Wes. who has

been more uniform than the rest, has thought fit to desert his favourite phrase, in translating Mr. ix. 22. where the man who brought his son to Jesus to be cured, says, as he renders it, If thou canst do any thing, *have compassion on us*, σπλαγχνισθεις εφ' ημας, *and help us*. So also says Wy. Both have been sensible that *emotions of tender compassion*, and *the yearning of the bowels*, would make an awkward and affected figure in this place. The plea from etymology, in a point which ought to be determined solely by use, where use can be discovered, is very weak. If I should render this expression in Cicero, *stomachabatur, si quid asperius dixerin;* if I happened to use a severe expression, instantly *his stomach was disordered with vexation*, I believe I should be thought to translate ridiculously. And yet the last clause is exactly in the same taste with *his bowels yearned with compassion*. The style of the Evangelists is chaste and simple; no effort in them to say extraordinary things, or in an extraordinary manner. The diction, if not, when judged by the rhetorician's rules, pure and elegant, is however natural, easy, and modest. Though they did not seek out fine words, the plainest, and, to that class of people with whom they were conversant, the most obvious, came unsought. They aimed at no laboured antitheses, no rounded periods, no ambitious epithets, no accumulated superlatives. There is a naked beauty in their manner which is entirely their own. And with all the faults of the Vul. the barbarisms and solecisms with which it is chargeable, it has, in many places, more of that beautiful but unadorned simplicity than most modern translations. I should not have been at so much pains, where there is no material difference of meaning, but to take an occasion of showing, once for all, how idly some bestow their labour, hunting after imaginary emphasis, through the obscure mazes of etymology; a method which, in explaining any author in any language, could, with the greatest facility, be employed to make him say what he never formed a conception of. Diss. IV. § 26.

[2] *They were scattered and exposed*, ησαν εκλελυμενοι και ερριμμενοι. E. T. *They fainted and were scattered abroad.* It is acknowledged that in a very great number of MSS. the word is not εκλελυμενοι, but εσκυλμενοι. In regard to the reading in those copies, from which the Vul. and other ancient translations were

made, this is one of those cases in which nothing can be concluded with certainty. The reason is, one of the senses of the word *εκλελυμενοι*, namely, *fatigued, exhausted*, nearly coincides with the meaning of *εσκυλμενοι* ; consequently the version might have been the same, whichsoever way it stood in the translator's copy. Now if these translations be set aside, the preponderancy is not such as ought in reason to determine us against the reading which suits best the context. To me the common reading appears, in this respect, preferable. Now the word *εκλυω*, when applied either to a flock or to a multitude of people, means *dissipo, I scatter*, as well as *debilito, I weaken ;* nor can any thing be better suited to the scope of the passage. Be. has preferred that sense, and Elsner has well supported it, as he has, in like manner, the true meaning of *ερριμμενοι* in this place, as signifying *exposed.* This interpretation has also the advantage of being equally adapted to the literal sense, and to the figurative; to the similitude introduced, and to that with which the comparison is made. It is not a natural consequence of the absence of the shepherd that the sheep should be *fatigued* and *worn out*, or *languid*, but it is the consequence that they should be *scattered* and *exposed* to danger. The shepherd prevents their wandering, and protects them.

CHAPTER X.

2. *Apostles, αποστολων.* That is *missionaries, messengers.* It is rarely applied to any but those whom God, or one representing his person, as the chief magistrate or the high priest, sends on business of importance. The word occurs only once in the Septuagint. 1 Ki. xiv. 6. where Ahijah the prophet is, by those interpreters, represented as saying to the wife of Jeroboam, *Εγω ειμι αποστολος προς σε σκληρος.* After the captivity, in our Lord's time, the term was applied to those whom the high priest chose for counsellors, and to whom he commonly gave commission to collect the tribute payable to the temple from the Jews in distant regions. It continued in use, as we learn from Jerom, after the destruction of the temple and dispersion of the people by Titus Vespasian. Thus, accounting for the expression used by Paul, Gal. i. 1. he says, "Usque hodie a patriarchis Judæorum "apostolos mitti constat. Ad distinctionem itaque eorum qui "mittuntur, ab hominibus et sui, qui sit missus a Christo, tale

"sumpsit exordium, *Paulus apostolus, non ab hominibus, ne-* "*que per hominem.*" We may add that in the N. T. the term is once applied to Jesus Christ himself, Heb. iii. 1. Some are denominated, 2 Cor. viii. 23. *αποστολοι εκκλησιων*. But the denomination, *Apostles of Christ*, seems to have been given to none but the twelve, Matthias who was substituted in the place of Judas, and Paul and Barnabas who were commissioned to the Gentiles. J. x. 36.

[2] *The first Simon, πρωτος Σιμων*. Though the Gr. here has no article, it is necessary to translate it *the first*, otherwise the word *first* would be an adverb, and could answer only to *πρωτον*.

[3] *James, Ιακωβος*. The name is the same with that of the Patriarch; but immemorial custom has appropriated in our language the name *James* to the two Apostles, and *Jacob* to the Patriarch. Diss. XII. P. III. § 13.

[4] *James, son of Zebedee, Ιακωβος ὁ του Ζεβεδαιου*. And,

3. *James, son of Alpheus, Ιακωβος ὁ του Αλφαιου*. In both the above instances the Gr. article serves merely for supplying the ellipsis. It occupies the place of *υἱος*, and is therefore more justly rendered *son* than *the son*. Ch. i. 6. N.

4. *Cananite, Κανανιτης*. E. T. *Canaanite*. But this is the name, always given in the O. T. to a descendant of Canaan, son of Ham, and grandson of Noah; and is in Gr. not *Κανανιτης* but *Χαναναιος*. The Vul. indeed seems to have read so, rendering it *Chananæus*. But this reading is not supported by either versions or MSS. nor has it any internal probability to recommend it. Some think the Gr. word imports a native or inhabitant of *Cana* in Galilee. Others are of opinion that it is a Sy. word used by Mt. and Mr. of the same import with the Gr. *ζηλωτης* employed by L. in reference to the same person. L. vi. 15. N.

[2] *He who betrayed him, ὁ και παραδους αυτον*. Vul. *Qui et tradidit eum*. Er. Zu. Be. Cas. Pisc. and Cal. all use *prodidit*, instead of *tradidit*. All modern translators I am acquainted with (except Beau. and Si. who say, *qui livra Jesus*), whether they translate from the Gr. or from the Vul. have in this particular followed the modern La. interpreters. Now it is evident that in this the Vul. has adhered more closely both to the letter and to the spirit of the original than the other versions. *Παραδουναι*, Wet. observes is *tradere*, *προδουναι* is *prodere*. The former expresses simply the fact, without any note of praise or blame; the other

marks the fact as criminal, and is properly a term of reproach. Now there is this peculiarity in the spirit of those writers, that, when speaking in their own character as historians, they satisfy themselves with relating the bare facts, without either using such terms, or affixing such epithets, as might serve to impress their readers with their sentiments concerning them, either of censure or of commendation. They tell the naked truth, without hinting an opinion, and leave the truth to speak for itself. They have hit the happy medium, in narrative writing, that they avoid equally the slightest appearance, on one hand, of coldness and indifference, and on the other, of passion and prejudice. It was said of their Master, *Never man spake like this man.* May it not be justly affirmed of these his biographers, *Never men wrote like these men?* And if their manner be unlike that of other men in general, it is more especially unlike that of fanatics of all denominations. Some may be surprized, after reading this remark, that I have not myself used the more general expression, and said, *Delivered him up.* Had I been the first who rendered the Gospels into Eng. I should certainly have so rendered that passage. But the case is totally different, now that our ears are inured to another dialect, especially as the customary expression contains nothing but what is strictly true. It is not easy to make so great an alteration, and at the same time preserve a simple and unaffected manner of writing. A translator, by appearing to seek about for an unusual term, may lose more of the genius of the style in one way than he gains in another. There is the greater danger in regard to this term, as, for the same reason for which we render it *deliver up* in this passage, we ought to translate it so in every other, which in some places, in consequence of our early habits, would sound very awkwardly. But that the manner of the evangelists may not be in any degree mistaken from the version, I thought it necessary to add this note. Diss. III. § 23.

5. *A Samaritan city*, πολιν Σαμαρειτων. Vul. *civitates Samaritanorum* in the plural. This reading has no support from MSS. or versions.

8. In the common Gr. copies, νεκρους εγειρετε, *raise the dead*, is found immediately after λεπρους καθαριζετε. But, it is wanting in a great number of the most valuable MSS. in the com. polyglot, and in the Arm. and Eth. versions. And, though it is retained

in the Sy. and also in the Vul. where it is transposed, it is evident that Jerom did not find it in any of his best MSS. as he has omitted it totally in his Commentary, where every other clause of the sentence is specially taken notice of. Neither did Chr. Euth. or Theo. find it in the copies used by them. There is this further evidence against it, that it is not mentioned, either in the beginning of the chapter, where the powers conferred on the Apostles are related, whereof this, had it been granted, must be considered as the principal; or in the parallel passages of L. where the Apostles are said to have been commissioned, and to have had powers bestowed on them. This power they seem never to have received till after the resurrection of their Lord.

9. *In your girdles.* Their purses were commonly in their girdles.

10. *No scrip, μη πηραν εις ὁδον.* E. T. *No scrip for your journey.* I understand *scrip* to signify a travelling bag or wallet, and consequently to answer to *πηρα εις ὁδον.* But whatever be in this, the words in connection sufficiently show the meaning.

[2] *Staves.* The common reading in Gr. is *ραβδον.* This is one of the few instances in which our translators have not scrupled to desert the ordinary editions, and say *staves*, notwithstanding that the Vul. agrees with the common Gr. and has *virgam.* There is sufficient ground, however, for preferring the other reading, which is not only well supported by MSS. some versions, and old editions, and is approved by Wet. and other critics; but is entirely conformable to those instructions as represented by the other Evangelists.

[3] *No spare coats, shoes, or staves, μηδε δυο χιτωνας, μεδε ὑποδηματα, μηδε ραβδον.* E. T. *Neither two coats, neither shoes, nor yet staves.* I consider the word *δυο* as equally belonging to all the three articles here conjoined, coats, shoes, and staves. Now, as it would be absurd to represent it as Christ's order, *Take not with you two shoes;* and as the Heb. word rendered in the Sep. *ὑποδηματα* is Am. ii. 6. and viii. 6. properly translated *a pair of shoes*, being, according to the Masora, in the dual number, I have rendered the word *δυο* here *spare;* (that is, such as ye are not using at present), for by this means I both avoid the impropriety, and exactly hit the sense in them all.

4 *Of his maintenance, της τροφης αυτου.* E. T. *Of his meat.* But the three particulars last mentioned, *coat*, *staff*, and *shoes*, are surely not *meat*, in any sense of the word. This, if there were no other argument, sufficiently shows, that our Lord included more under the term *τροφη* than *food.* He prohibits them from incumbering themselves with any articles of raiment, beside what they were wearing, or with money to purchase more, when these should be worn out. Why? Because they would be entitled to a supply from those on whom their labours would be bestowed, and money would be but an incumbrance to them. The word is used by a synecdoche, perfectly agreeable to the Oriental idiom, which sometimes makes the term *bread* denote every thing necessary for subsistence. Sc. has shown that this interpretation of *τροφη* is not unsupported by classical authority.

12. The Vul. subjoins to this verse, *Dicentes, Pax huic domui, Saying, Peace be to this house.* The corresponding words in Gr. are found in some MSS. but not in so many as to give any countenance for relinquishing the common reading, which agrees with the Sy. and the greater number of ancient versions; more especially, as some editions of the Vul. omit these words, and as the connection is complete without them. There is ground to think, that such corrections have sometimes arisen from an ill-judged zeal in transcribers, to render the Gospels more conformable to one another. That the common Jewish salutation was, *Peace be to this house*, is well known. I have, therefore, for the greater perspicuity, rendered *η ειρηνη υμων*, in the 13th verse, *the peace ye wish them.* This, at the same time that it gives exactly the sense, renders the addition to the 12th verse quite unnecessary.

14. *Shake the dust off your feet.* It was maintained by the scribes, that the very dust of a heathen country polluted their land, and therefore ought not to be brought into it. Our Lord here, adopting their language, requires his disciples, by this action, to signify that those Jewish cities which rejected their doctrine, deserved a regard noway superior to that which they themselves showed to the cities of Pagans. It is added in the gospels of Mr. and L. *εις μαρτυριον, for a testimony*, that is, not a denunciation of judgments, but a public and solemn *protestation against them.*

18. *To bear testimony to them, εις μαρτυριον αυτοις.* Mr. xiii. 9. N.

20. *It shall not be ye——but——* The meaning is, *It shall not be ye so much as——*Ch. ix. 13. [3] Note.

23. *When they persecute you in one city, οταν διωκωσιν υμας εν τη πολει ταυτη.* Two or three copies, none of the most esteemed, read *εκ της πολεως ταυτης.* Chr. and Orig. also, found this reading in those used by them. But neither the author of the Vul. nor any ancient translator, appears to have read so. Had there been ground for admitting this reading, the proper translation would have been, *When they banish you out of one city.*

[2] *Another.* Ch. xxvii. 61. N.

[3] *Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel, ου μη τελεσητε τας πολεις του Ισραηλ.* Be. *Nequaquam obieritis urbes Israelis.* The late learned Bishop Pearce objects to this version that, though *τελειν οδον*, and *τελειν* alone (*οδον* being understood), are used for accomplishing a journey; he had seen no example of *τελειν πολεις*, for going over, or travelling through, towns. It is sufficient to answer, that we have seen no example of his sense of the word, adapted to the phrase here used; for *τελειν μυστηρια*, and *τελειν τινι απορρητα*, are at least as dissimilar to *τελειν πολιν*, as *τελειν οδον* is. Besides, there is nothing in the scriptural style resembling that of the Pagans, when speaking of what they called their mysteries; though I acknowledge that a great deal of this sort is to be found in the ecclesiastical writers of the fourth and fifth centuries, who affected to accommodate the Pagan phraseology to the Christian doctrine and worship, which they not a little corrupted thereby. But nothing serves more strongly to evince, that the sense which Be. has given to the words is the natural and obvious sense, than the manner in which Chr. explains this passage. He does not seem to have discovered, that the word *τελειν*, joined with *πολιν*, had any thing either difficult or uncommon in it; but observing the encouragement given to the Apostles in the promise, he thus expresses in his own words, as is usual with him, the import of it, *ου φθασετε περιελθοντες την Παλαιστινην, Ye shall not have finished your travelling through Palestine.* I shall only add, that the word *consummabitis* used by the Vul. is rather ambiguous, and may be differently interpreted. Er. Zu. and Cal. who say *perambulaveritis*, perfectly agree in sense with Be. So, I imagine, does Cas. though he uses the more indefinite and less proper term, *perlustraveritis.*

25. *Beelzebub*, *Βεελξεβουλ*. Vul. *Beelzebub*. In this instance, our translators have adopted the reading of the Vul. in preference to that of the Gr. With the Vul. agree the Sy. Eth. and Ara. versions. It is remarkable, that there is no variation in the Gr. MSS. all of which make the word terminate in λ, not in β. All the learned seem to be agreed, that Beelzebub was the Oriental name. It were superfluous to examine the conjectures of critics on this subject. The obvious reason of this change appears to be that assigned by Gro. No Gr. word ends in β; and those who wrote in that language, in order to accommodate themselves to the pronunciation of the people who spoke it, were accustomed to make some alterations on foreign names. Thus, Sennacherib is in the Sep. *Σενναχηρειμ*; and Habakkuk, for a like reason, is *Αμβακουμ*. On how many of the Heb. names of the O. T. is a much greater change made in the N. in regard to which we find no different reading in the MSS.? I suppose, however, that the reason of the preference given by our translators, was not because the sound was more conformable to the Oriental word, a thing of no consequence to us, but because, through the universal use of Vul. before the Reformation, men were accustomed to the one name, and strangers to the other. The word Beelzebub means *the Lord of flies*. It is thought to be the name of some Syrian idol, but whether given by the worshippers themselves, or, as was not unusual, by the Jews in contempt, is to us matter only of conjecture.

26. *Therefore, fear them not. Μη ουν φοβηθητε αυτους*· Dr. Symonds asks (p. 74) "Could our Saviour mean, that the reason why his apostles had no just grounds of fear, was because they "were sure to meet with barbarous treatment?" I answer, 'No; 'but because they could meet with no treatment, however bad, 'which he had not borne before, and which they had not been 'warned, and should therefore be prepared, to expect. This meaning results more naturally from the scope of the place, than that 'given by him.'

27. *From the house-tops*. Their houses were all flat-roofed.

29. *A penny*. Diss. VIII. P. I. § 10.

31. *Ye are much more valuable than sparrows, πολλων στρουθιων διαφερετε υμεις*. E. T. *Ye are of more value than many sparrows*. One MS. and the Com. read *πολλω* for *πολλων*

This, I acknowledge, is of no weight. The same sense is conveyed either way. Cas. *Longè passeribus antecellitis vos.* This expression is more conformable to modern idioms.

34. *I came not to bring peace, but a sword.* } An energetic
35. *I am come to make dissension.* } mode of expressing the certainty of a foreseen consequence of any measure, by representing it as the purpose for which the measure was adopted. This idiom is familiar to the Orientals, and not unfrequent in other authors, especially poets and orators.

38. *He who will not take his cross and follow me.* Every one condemned by the Romans to crucifixion, was compelled to carry the cross on which he was to be suspended, to the place of execution. In this manner our Lord himself was treated. Properly, it was not the whole cross that was carried by the convict, But the cross-beam. The whole was more than suited the natural strength of a man to carry. The perpendicular part probably remained in the ground; the tranverse beam (here called *the cross*) was added, when there was an execution. As this was not a Jewish but a Roman punishment, the mention of it on this occasion may justly be looked on as the first hint given by Jesus of the death he was to suffer. If it had been usual in the country to execute criminals in this manner, the expression might have been thought proverbial, for denoting to prepare for the worst.

39. *He who preserveth his life shall lose it.* There is in this sentence a kind of paronomasia, whereby the same word is used in different senses, in such a manner as to convey the sentiment with greater energy to the attentive. 'He who, by making a sacrifice of 'his duty, preserves temporal life, shall lose eternal life; and contra-'riwise.' The like trope our Lord employs in that expression, ch. viii. 22. *Let the dead bury their dead.* Let the spiritually dead bury the naturally dead. See also ch. xiii. 12. In the present instance, the trope has a beauty in the original, which we cannot give it in a version. The word ψυχη is equivocal, signifying both *life* and *soul*, and consequently is much better fitted for exhibiting with entire perspicuity, the two meanings, than the Eng. word *life*. The Syro-Chaldaic, which was the language then spoken in Palestine, had, in this respect, the same advantage with the Gr.

CHAPTER XI.

1. *Give warning.* Diss. VI. P. V. § 2, &c.

2 *In the cities, εν ταις πολεσιν αυτων.* E. T. *In their cities.* It is not uncommon in the Oriental dialects, to employ a pronoun where the antecedent, to which it refers, is not expressed, but understood. In this way *αυτων* is here used; for it must refer to the Galileans, in whose country they then were. But as the pronoun is not necessary in Eng. and as in our ears it would appear to refer to disciples, and so might mislead, it is better omitted.

2. *Of the Messiah, του Χριστου.* A few MSS. and the Eth. version, read *του Ιησου.* It is not in itself improbable, that this is the true reading, though too weakly supported to authorize an alteration in the text. *Ιησους, Κυριος, Θεος,* and *Χριστος,* having been anciently almost always written by contraction, were more liable to be mistaken than other words. If, however, the common reading be just, it deserves to be remarked, that the word *Χριστος* is never, when alone, and with the article, used in the Gospels, as a proper name. It is the name of an office. The import of the expression must therefore be, 'When John had heard that those works were 'performed by Jesus, which are characteristical of the Messiah, he 'sent.' Diss. V. P. IV. § 6—9.

3. *He that cometh, ὁ ερχομενος.* E. T. *He that should come.* I thought it better to render this literally, because it is one of the titles by which the Messiah was distinguished. It answers in Gr. to the Heb. הבא *haba,* taken from Psal. cxviii. 26. where he is denominated, *He that cometh in the name of the Lord.* The beginning of a description is usually employed to suggest the whole. Indeed the whole is applied to him, ch. xxi. 9. Mr. xi. 9. L. xix. 38. J. xii. 13. and sometimes the abbreviation, as here, and in J. vi. 14. Heb. x. 37. *ὁ ερχομενος* seems to have been a title as much appropriated as *ὁ Χριστος,* and *ὁ υιος του Δαβιδ.*

5. *Good news is brought.* Diss. V. P. II.

6. *To whom I shall not prove a stumbling-block, ὁς εαν μη σκανδαλισθη εν εμοι.* Ch. v. 29. N.

7. *A reed shaken by the wind?* A proverbial expression; implying, 'It is surely not for any trifling matter that ye have gone 'thither.'

8. *Ανθρωπον εν μαλακοις ἱματιοις ημφιεσμενον—οἱ τα μαλακα φορουντες*—It was observed (Diss. X. P. V. § 2.) that, when a particular species was denoted by an adjective added to the general name, the article, on occasion of repeating the name, is made to supply the place of the adjective; but here we have an example wherein, on rejecting the adjective, the substantive is supplied by prefixing the article *τα μαλακα* for *μαλακα ἱματια*. There is evidently, therefore, neither redundancy nor impropriety in using the article here, as some have vainly imagined. Either it or the repetition of the noun was necessary, in point of precision.

10. *Angel.* Diss. VIII. P. III. § 9, &c.

12. *Invaded.* The comparison is here to a country invaded and conquered, or to a city besieged and taken by storm.

13. *Were your instructers, προεφητευσαν.* Ch. vii. 15. N.

15. *Whoever hath ears,* &c. Diss. II. P. III. § 5.

16. *In the market-place, εν αγοραις.* E. T. *In the markets.* But a great number of MSS. as well as the Vul. Go. and Sy. versions, have the word in the singular. The passage was also read thus by some of the ancient expositors. Moreover, the reading itself appears preferable.

17. *We have sung mournful songs, εθρηνησαμεν.* E. T. *We have mourned.* But mourning and lamenting are nearly synonymous. Hence that indistinctness in the E. T. which makes a reader at a loss to know what those children wanted of their companions. If it was to join them in mourning, it would have been more natural to retain the word, and say, *But ye have not mourned with us.* There are other reasons which render this supposition improbable. One is, the former member of the sentence shows, that it was one part which one of the sets of boys had to play, and another that was expected from the other. A second reason is, the similarity of the construction in the corresponding clauses, and the difference in the contrasted; *ηυλησαμεν ὑμιν.—εθρηνησαμεν ὑμιν*, on one side, and *ουκ ωρχησασθε,—ουκ εκοψασθε* on the other. These things add a great degree of proba-

bility to the version I have given, after Er. and Cal. who say *lugubria cecinimus ;* Dio. G. F. and L. Cl. who render the words in the same way, and Hey. who says, *sung mournful tunes.* But what puts it, with me, beyond a doubt, is, to find that the Seventy use θρηνος for *elegy*, or *song of lamentation*, and θρηνειν for *to sing such a song.* See 2 Sam. i. 17. For that the *lamentation* there following is a song or poem, is evident from its structure. See also the preamble in the Sep. to the book of Lamentations, where the song which immediately follows, composed alphabetically in the manner of some of the Psalms, is denominated θρηνος, as indeed are all the other poems of that book. That the Jews used such melancholy music, sometimes instrumental, sometimes vocal, at funerals, and on other calamitous occasions, appears from several passages of Scripture. In Jeremiah's time, they had women whose occupation it was to sing them, Jer ix. 17. They are called in the Sep. θρηνουσαι. The word is weakly rendered in our version *the mourning women ;* much better by Cas. *præficas*, women who, in melodious strains, gave vent to their lamentations. For those who know the power of music in conjunction with poetry will admit that these, by a wonderful charm, soothe, at the same time that they excite, the sorrow of the hearers. The words which follow in v. 18. render the justness of this interpretation still more evident. They are thus translated by Houbigant, *Ut cito edant in nobis cantus lugubres, ut lachrymas effundant oculi nostri, &c.* And in regard to the sense, not much differently by Cas. *Quæ nœniam de nobis editum propere veniant ; profundantque oculi nostri lacrymas, &c.* In v. 20. which in our version is unintelligible (for how mere wailing, artificially taught, could gratify a person in real grief, is beyond comprehension), the difficulty is entirely removed by a right translation. Houbigant, *Instituite ad lamentum filias vestras, suam quæque sodalem ad cantus lugubres.* Cas. to the same purpose, *Filias vestras nœniam, et alias aliæ lamentationem docete.* In classical use also θρηνειν has often the same signification, and answers to *nœniam edere. Nœnia*, says Festus, *est carmen quod in funere, laudandi gratia, cantatur ad tibiam.*

19. *Wisdom is justified.* L. vii. 35 N.

20. *Began to reproach*, ηρξατο ονειδιζειν. Mr. v. 17. N.

21. *Wo unto thee Chorazin.* L. vi. 24. N.

[a] *In sackcloth and ashes*; that is, 'the deepest contrition and 'sorrow.' *Sackcloth and ashes* were the outward signs of penitence in those days.

23. *Which hast been exalted to heaven, ἡ ἑως του ουρανου ὑψωθησῃ.* Vul. *Numquid usque in cælum exaltaberis?* The Cop. and the Eth. versions read in the same manner. In conformity to these, we find in a very few Gr. MSS. *μη ἑως του ουρανου ὑψωθησῃ.*

[z] *Hades.* Diss. VI. P. II. § 2, *&c.*

25. *I adore thee, εξομολογουμαι σοι.* E. T. *I thank thee.* The word sometimes denotes, *to confess sins*, sometimes *to acknowledge favours*, and sometimes also *to adore* or *celebrate.* It is in the last of these senses I understand the word here. The nature of the sentiment makes this probable. But the reason assigned, v. 26. removes all doubt, *Yes, Father, because such is thy pleasure.* 'Every thing in which I discover thy will, I receive, not with acquiescence barely, but with veneration.'

[z] *Having hidden these things,—thou hast revealed them, απεκρυψας ταυτα,—και απεκαλυψας αυτα.* E. T. *Thou hast hid these things,—and hast revealed them.* We have the same idiom, Rom. vi. 17. *God be thanked that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed;* the thanks are not given for their having been formerly the servants of sin, but for their being then obedient, Is. xii. 1. rendered literally from the Heb. is, *Lord, I will praise thee, because thou wast angry with me, thine anger is turned away.* In interpreting this, our translators have not been so scrupulous, but have rendered the middle clause, *though thou wast angry with me.* I know not why they have not followed the same method here. *Having hidden* implies barely, *not having revealed*, Mr. iii. 4. N.

[3] *From sages and the learned, απο σοφων και συνετων.* E. T. *From the wise and prudent. Σοφος*, as used by the Evangelists, must be understood as equivalent to the Heb. חכם *hacham*, which, from signifying *wise* in the proper sense, came, after the establishment of academies in the country, often to denote those who had the superintendency of these seminaries, or a principal part in teaching. It seems also to have been used almost synonymously with *scribe;* so that in every view it suggests rather the

literary honours a man has attained, than the *wisdom* of which he is possessed. *Συνετος* answers to the Heb. word נבון *nabon* which is more properly *intelligent* or *learned* than *prudent;* and both refer more to the knowledge acquired by study and application, than to what arises from experience and a good understanding. Accordingly they are here contrasted not with *μωρους*, *fools*, but with *νηπιοις*, *babes*, persons illiterate, whose minds had not been cultivated in the schools of the rabbies.

29. *Be taught by me*, *μαθετε απ' εμου*. E. T. *Learn of me.* The phrase in Eng. is commonly understood to signify, *Follow my example.* But this does not express the full import, which is, *Be my disciples, be taught by me*, and is explanatory of the first order, *Take my yoke upon you.* See J. vi. 45. where *being taught of God*, and *learning of the Father*, are used as synonymous.

[2] *Condescending*, *ταπεινος τη καρδια*. E. T. *Lowly in heart.* I think, with Elsner, that our Lord's direct aim in this address is not to recommend these virtues in him to the imitation of the people, but himself to their choice as a teacher. The whole is to be explained therefore as having a view to this end. 'Be 'instructed by me, whom ye will find a meek and condescending 'teacher, not rough, haughty, and impatient, but one who can bear 'with the infirmities of the weak; and who, more desirous to edify 'others than to please himself, will not disdain to adapt his lessons 'to the capacities of the learners.'

CHAPTER XII.

1. *Began to pluck*, *ηρξαντο τιλλειν*. Mr. v. 17. N.

2. *What it is not lawful.* Plucking the ears of corn they considered as a species of reaping, and consequently as servile work, and not to be done on the sabbath.

4. *The tabernacle*, *τον οικον*. E. T. *The house.* The temple, which is oftenest in Scripture called *the house of God*, was not then built. And if the house of the high priest be here denominated *God's house*, as some learned men have supposed, the application is, I suspect, without example. I think, therefore, it is rather to be understood of the tabernacle formerly used, including the sacred pavilion, or sanctuary, and the court. These, before the building of the temple, we find commonly denominat-

ed the house of God. Further, that it was not into the holy place that David went, appears from this circumstance, the loaves of which he partook had been that day removed from before the Lord, and new bread had been put in their room, 1 Sam. xxi. 6. For the sake of perspicuity therefore, and because we do not apply the word *house* to such a portable habitation, I have thought it better to use some general name, as tabernacle or mansion, for under either of these terms the court or inclosure may be also comprehended.

[3] *The loaves of the presence, τους αρτους της προθεσεως.* E. T. *The shew-bread.* The Heb. expression, rendered literally, is *the loaves of the face*, or *of the presence.* This I thought it better to restore, than to continue in using a term which conveys an improper notion of the thing. Purver, whose version I have not seen, uses, as I am informed, the same expression.

5. *Violate the rest to be observed on sabbaths, τοις σαββασιν το σαββατον βεβηλουσι.* E. T. *On the sabbath days profane the sabbath.* This looks oddly, as though the sabbath could be profaned on any other day. Let it be observed, that the Heb. word for *Sabbath* signifies also *rest*, and is used in both senses in this verse. The Evangelist, or rather his translator into Greek, though he retained the original word, has, to hint a difference in the meaning, made an alteration on it, when introduced the second time. Thus he uses *σαββασι*, from *σαββας*, for the *day*; but *σαββατον* for the sabbatical rest. If it be asked, how the priests violate the sabbatical rest? the answer is obvious, by killing and preparing the sacrifices, as well as by other pieces of manual labour absolutely necessary in performing the religious service which God had established among them.

6. *Something greater, μειζων.* E. T. *A greater.* But very many MSS. and some ancient expositors read *μειζον.* This is also more conformable to the style in similar cases. See xi. 9. and in this ch. see the note on v. 41. and 42.

8. *Of the sabbath, και του σαββατου.* E. T. *Even of the sabbath.* The *και* is wanting here in a very great number of MSS. in some early editions, in the Sy. and Cop. versions. It seems not to have been read by several ancient writers, and is rejected by Mill and Wetstein, and other critics.

14. *To destroy him, οπως αυτον απολεσωσι.* E. T. *How they might destroy him.* Most modern translations, as well as the

Eng. have in this followed the Vul. which says, *Quomodo perderent eum.* Yet ὁπως is not commonly rendered *quomodo* but *ut*. There seems to be no MS. which has πως, else I should have suspected that this had been the reading in the copy used by the La. translator. It is true that ὁπως answers sometimes to *quomondo*, as well as to *ut ;* but it is a good rule in translating, always to prefer the usual signification, unless it would imply something absurd, or at least unsuitable to the scope of the place. Neither of these is the case here. If there be any difference, the ordinary acceptation is the preferable one. This is the first time that mention is made of a design on our Saviour's life. It is natural to think that the historian would acquaint us of their concurring in the design, before he would speak of their consulting about the means. The explanations given by the Greek Fathers supply, in some respects, an ancient version, as they frequently give the sense of the original in other words. In this passage, Chr. renders ὁπως by *ινα ut*, not by πως or *ον τροπον quomodo. Συμβουλενονται ινα ανελωσιν αυτον.*

16. *Enjoining them.* Mr. ix. 25. N.

20. *A dimly burning taper he will not quench,* λινον τυφομενον ου σβεσει. E. T. *Smoking flax shall he not quench.* By an easy metonymy the material for the thing made, *flax*, is here used for the *wick* of a lamp or taper, and that by a synecdoche, for the *lamp*, or *taper* itself, which, when near going out, yields more smoke than light. The Sy. Ara. and Per. render it *lamp*, Dio. says, *lucignuolo.* See Lowth's translation of Isaiah, xlii. 3.

23. *Is this the son of David?* μητι ουτος εστιν ὁ υιος Δαβιδ ; E. T. *Is not this the son of David ?* Vul. and Ar. *Numquid hic est filius David ?* With this agree in sense, Er. Zu. Cal. Pisc. and Cas. only using *num*, not *numquid.* Be. alone says, *Nonne iste est filius ille Davidis ?* And in this he has been followed by the Eng. and some other Protestant translators. The Sy. and most of the ancient versions agree with the Vul. Sc. observes that μητι is not used by Mt. to interrogate negatively. He might have added, nor by any writer of the N. T. *Nonne* does not answer to μητι ; but *num*, or *numquid*, in Eng. *whether.* Only let it be observed, that *whether* with us would often be superfluous, when μητι in Gr. and

num in La. would be necessary for distinguishing a question from an affirmation. See. ch. vii. 16. Mr. iv. 21. xiv. 19. L. vi. 39. J. vii. 31. viii. 22. xviii. 35. xxi. 5 2 Cor. xii. 18. In any one of these places, to render it by a negative would pervert the sense. These are all the places wherein it occurs in this form. The only other passage in the N. T. where it is found is 1 Cor. vi. 3. There it has an additional particle, and is not μητι but μητιγε, used for stating a comparison, and rendered *how much more?* This therefore cannot be called an exception. I own, at the same time, that to say, *Is this*, or *Is not this*, in a case like the present, makes little change in the sense. Both express doubtfulness, but with this difference, that the former seems to imply that *disbelief*, the latter that *belief*, preponderates. J. iv. 29. N.

24. *This man*, ουτος. E. T. *This fellow.* Why did not our translators say in the preceding verse, *Is not this fellow the Son of David?* The pronoun is the same in both. Our idiom, in many cases, will not permit us to use the demonstrative, without adding a noun. But as the Gr. term does not imply, a translator is not entitled to add, any thing contemptuous. By such freedoms, one of the greatest beauties of these divine writers has been considerably injured. Diss. III. § 23.

29. *The strong one's house.* L. xi. 21. N.

31. *Detraction*, βλασφημια. Vul. *Blasphemia.* E. T. *Blasphemy.* Cas. *Maledictum.* Er. Zu. Pisc. and Cal. *Convitium.* The Gr. word denotes injurious expressions, or *detraction* in the largest acceptation, whether against God or man. When God is the object, it is properly rendered *blasphemy.* It is evident, that in this passage both are included, as the different kinds are compared together, consequently the general term ought to be employed, which is applicable alike to both: whereas the term *blasphemy*, with us, is not used of any verbal injury that is not aimed directly against God. Diss. IX. P. II.

[2] *In men is pardonable*, αφεθησεται τοις ανθρωποις. E. T. *Shall be forgiven unto men.* As the Heb. has no subjunctive or potential mood, the future tense is frequently made use of, for supplying this defect. This idiom is common in the Sep. and has been thence adopted into the N. T. It is evidently our Lord's

meaning here, not that every such sin shall actually be pardoned, but that it is, in the divine economy, capable of being pardoned, or is *pardonable*. The words in connection sufficiently secure this term from being interpreted *venial*, as it sometimes denotes. The words *remissible* and *irremissible*, would have been less equivocal, but are rather technical terms, than words in common use.

[3] *Against the spirit.* Diss. IX. P. II. § 17.

32. *In the present state,—in the future*, εν τουτω τω αιωνι,—εν τω μελλοντι. E. T. *In this world,—in the world to come.* The word *state* seems to suit better here than either *age*, which some prefer, or *world*, as in the common version. Admit, though by no means certain, that by the two αιωνες are here meant the *Jewish* dispensation and the *Christian*. These we cannot in Eng. call *ages;* as little can we name them *worlds*. The latter implies too much, and the former too little. But they are frequently and properly called *states*. And as there is an ambiguity in the original (for the first clause may mean the present life, and the second the life that follows), the Eng. word *state* is clearly susceptible of this interpretation likewise. And though I consider it as a scrupulosity bordering on superstition, to preserve in a version every ambiguous phrase that may be found in the original, where the scope of the passage, or the words in construction, sufficiently ascertain the sense; yet where there is real ground to doubt about the meaning, one does not act the part of a faithful translator, who does not endeavour to give the sentiment in the same latitude to his readers in which the author gave it to him. This may not always be possible; but, where it is possible, it should be done. Diss. XII. P. I. § 23.

35. *Out of his good treasure*, εκ του αγαθου θησαυρου της καρδιας. E. T. *Out of the good treasure of the heart.* But the words της καρδιας are wanting in so many MSS. even those of the greatest note, ancient versions, and commentators, that they cannot be regarded as authentic. Pearce, through I know not what inadvertency, has said that the word here should be rendered *treasury*. *The treasury* is the place where treasure is deposited, which may be a very noble edifice, though all the treasure it contains be good for nothing. Now a man's producing good things is surely an evidence of the goodness, not of his *store-house*, but of his *stores*.

36. *Pernicious word*, ρημα αργον. E. T. *Idle word.* Cas. *Malum verbum.* The epithet αργος, when applied to words, has been shown by several to denote *pernicious*, *false*, *calumnious.* To this sense the context naturally leads. In the primitive meaning, *idle* it is applicable only to persons. When it is applied to things, as the words or actions of men, it is understood to denote such in quality as spring from habitual idleness. And in this class the Jews were wont to rank almost all the vices of the tongue, particularly *lying* and *defamation.* See 1 Tim. v. 13. Consider also the import of the phrase γαστερες αργαι, in the character given of the Cretans, Tit. i. 12. This, if we render the word αργος as in the text, is *idle bellies*, which, if we were to interpret it by our idiom, ought to denote *abstemiousness*, as in the abstemious the *belly* may be said to be comparatively *idle* or unemployed. Yet the meaning is certainly the reverse. The author's idea is rather *bellies of the idle*, those who spend their time merely in pampering themselves. Thus *cruel hands* are the hands of *cruel persons*, an *envious eye* is the eye of a man or woman actuated by envy, a *contemptuous look* the look of one who cannot conceal his contempt. From this rule of interpretation, in such cases, I do not know a single exception. And by this rule interpreted ρηματα αργα is such conversation as abounds most with habitual idlers. It was not uncommon with the Jewish doctors, to make *verba otii* stand as a contrast to *verba veritatis*, thus employing it as a euphemism for falsehood and lies. I am far from intending, by this remark, to signify that what we commonly call *idle*, that is vain and unedifying *words*, are not sinful, and consequently to be brought into judgment. If these be not comprehended in the ρηματα αργα of this passage, they may be included in the μωρολογια, *foolish talking*, mentioned by the Apostle, Eph. v. 4.

37. *Or*, και. As both clauses in this verse cannot be applied to the same person, this is one of the cases wherein the copulative is properly rendered *or*.

38. *A sign ;* that is, 'a miracle in proof of thy mission.'

39. *Adulterous*, μοιχαλις. Vul. *Adultera.* "This may be "understood," says Si. "suitably to the symbolical phraseology "of ancient prophecy, as denoting *infidel*, *apostate*." He has accordingly, in his translation, rendered it *infidele.* I cannot help

observing that, if this had been the rendering in the version of P. R. which here keeps the beaten road, and says *adultere*, we should have been told by that critic, that the term employed by those interpreters was not a translation, but a comment, which they ought to have reserved for the margin. And I must acknowledge, that he would have had, in this place, more scope for the distinction, than, in many places, wherein he urges it. For it is very far from being evident that our Saviour here adopts the allegorical style of the prophets. Besides, in their style, it is *idolatry*, and not *infidelity*, which in Jews is called *adultery*. And with *idolatry* we do not find them charged in the N. T.

40. *Of the great fish*, του κητους. E. T. *The whale's*. But κητος is not a *whale*, it is a general name for any huge fish, or *sea monster*. It was the word used by the *Seventy*, properly enough, for rendering what was simply called, in Jonah, a *great fish*.

41. *They were warned by Jonah*. Diss. VI. P. V. § 2.

41, 42. *Something greater*, πλειον. E. T. *A greater*. There is a modesty and a delicacy in the use made of the neuter gender in these verses, which a translator ought not to overlook. Our Lord chooses, on this occasion, rather to insinuate, than to affirm, the dignity of his character; and to afford matter of reflection to the attentive amongst his disciples, without furnishing his declared enemies with a handle for contradiction.

44. *Furnished*, κεκοσμημενην. E. T. *Garnished*. Κοσμεω signifies *I adorn*, commonly, when applied to a person, *with apparel*, and to a house, *with furniture*. This in old Eng. has probably been the meaning of the word *to garnish*, agreeably to the import of its Fr. etymon, *garnir*.

46. *Brothers*. It is almost too well known to need being mentioned, that in the Heb. idiom near relations, such as nephews and cousins, are often styled *brothers*. The O. T. abounds with examples.

CHAPTER XIII.

3. *In parables*, εν παραβολαις. The word παραβολη, as used by the Evangelists, has all the extent of signification in which the Heb. משל *mashal* is used in the O. T. It not only means what

we call *parable*, but also comparison of any kind, nay *proverb*, *prediction*, or any thing figuratively or poetically expressed, sometimes any moral instruction, as L. xiv. 7. Our translators have not always rendered it *parable*. They call it *comparison*, Mr. iv. 30. *proverb*, L. iv. 23. *figure*, Heb. ix. 9. xi. 19. They have, however, retained the word *parable* in several places, where they had as good reason to change it as in those now mentioned. A *parable*, in the ordinary acceptation of the word in Eng. is a species of comparison. It differs from an *example*, in which there is properly no similitude, but an instance in kind. Of this sort is the story of the Pharisee and the Publican, who went up to the temple to pray; of the rich man and Lazarus, and of the compassionate Samaritan; also that of the fool, who, when his stores were increased, flattered himself that he had a security of enjoyment for many years. Nor is it every sort of comparison. What is taken entirely from still life we should hardly call a parable. Such is the comparison of the kingdom to a grain of mustard seed, and to leaven. Rational and active life seems always to enter into the notion. Further, the action must be feasible, or at least possible. Jotham's fable of the trees choosing a king, is properly an *apologue;* because, literally understood, the thing is impossible. There is also a difference between *parable* and *allegory*. In *allegory* (which is no other than a lesson delivered in metaphor) every one of the principal words has, through the whole, two meanings, the literal and the figurative. Whatever is advanced should be pertinent, understood either way. The allegory is always imperfect where this does not hold. It is not so in parable, where the scope is chiefly regarded, and not the words taken severally. That there be a resemblance in the principal incidents is all that is required. Smaller matters are considered only as a sort of drapery. Thus, in the parable of *the prodigal*, all the characters and chief incidents are significant, and can scarcely be misunderstood by an attentive reader; but to attempt to assign a separate meaning to *the best robe*, and *the ring*, and *the shoes*, and *the fatted calf*, and *the music*, and *the dancing*, betrays great want of judgment, as well as puerility of fancy. In those instructions of our Lord, promiscuously termed *parables*, there are specimens of all the different kinds above mentioned, *apologue* alone excepted. Let it be observed, that it matters not whether the relation itself be true

history or fiction. The truth of the parable lies in the justness of the application.

4. *The sower, ὁ σπειρων.* E. T. *A sower.* The article here is, in my opinion, not without design, as it suggests that the application is eminently to one individual.

5. *Rocky ground, τα πετρωδη.* E. T. *Stony places.* But this does not express the sense. There may be many loose stones, from which the place would properly be denominated *stony*, where the soil is both rich and deep. What is meant here is evidently continued rock, with a very thin cover of earth.

9. *Whoever hath ears.* Diss. II. P. III. § 5.

11. *The secrets, τα μυστηρια.* E. T. *The mysteries.* That the common signification of *μυστηρια* is, as rendered by Cas. *arcana*, there can be no doubt. Diss. IX. P. I. The moral truths here alluded to, and displayed in the explanation of the parable, are as far from being mysteries, in the common acceptation, *doctrines incomprehensible*, as any thing in the world can be.

12. *To him that hath.* Mr. iv. 24, 25. N.

14. *Is fulfilled, αναπληρουται.* I am not positive that the compound verb *αναπληροω* means more than the simple *πληροω*, which, for a reason assigned above (note on ch. i. 22.), I commonly translate *verify*. But as the word here is particular, and not used in any other passage of the Gospels, and as *ανα* in composition is sometimes what grammarians call intensive, I have imitated the Evangelist in changing the word. Though it is evident, from the passage in Isaiah, that the character quoted was that of the people in the prophet's time; we have reason to think that there must have been in the description a special view to the age of the Messiah, which the obduracy of Isaiah's contemporaries was exhibited chiefly to prefigure; for, of all the passages in the O. T. relating to these events, this is that which is the oftenest quoted in the New.

15. *Understanding, καρδια.* Diss. IV. § 23.

16. *Blessed, μακαριοι.* Though I commonly render this word *happy*, to distinguish it from *ευλογητος*, I do not think the application of the word *happy* in this verse would suit the Eng. idiom.

19. *Mindeth it not, μη συνιεντος.* E. T. *Understandeth it not.* Be. and Pisc. *Non attendit.* Beau. *Ne la goute point.* P. R. and Sa. *N'y fáit point d' attention.* That the verb συνιημι frequently means, both in the Sep. and in the N. T. *to mind, to regard, to attend to,* is unquestionable. See Ps. xli. 1. cvi. 7. Prov. xxi. 12. Rom. iii. 11. In two of these passages the common translation has *considereth ;* and though the verb *understand* is used in the other two, the context makes it manifest, that the meaning is the same. In the passage under review, An. Hey. Wes. use the verb *consider;* Wor. and Wa. *regard.* This remark affects also v. 13.

19, &c. *That which fell, &c. ὁ σπαρεις.* E. T. *He which received seed.* I agree with Ham. in thinking that ὁ σπορος, *the seed,* a word in common use both in the Sep. and in the N. T. is here understood. It is this which alone can be said to be sown, and not the persons who are figured by the different soils. In the other way of explaining it, there is such a jumble of the literal sense and of the figurative, as presents no image to the mind, and is unexampled in holy writ.

[a] *Εστι,* in such cases, is properly rendered *denotes.*

21. *He relapseth, σκανδαλιζεται.* E. T. *He is offended.* For the general import of the Gr. word, see the note on ch. v. 29. The precise meaning in this passage is plainly indicated by the connexion. Notice is taken of a temporary convert made by the word, whom persecution causes to relapse into his former state. Cas. renders it *desciscit.* This is agreeable to the sense, and an exact version of the word αφιστανται used in the parallel place, L. viii. 13.

24. *May be compared to a field, in which the proprietor had sown good grain, ωμοιωθη ανθρωπω σπειροντι καλον σπερμα εν τω αγρω αυτου.* It is admitted on all sides that, in translating these similitudes, the words ought not to be traced with rigour. The meaning is sufficiently evident.

25. *Darnel, ζιζανια.* E. T. *Tares.* Vul. Ar. Er. Zu. Cal. Be. Pisc. *Zizania.* Cas. (because *zizanium* is not Lat.) has chosen to employ a general appellation, and say, *Malas herbas.* It appears from the parable itself, 1st, That this weed was not only hurtful to the corn, but otherwise of no value, and therefore to be severed and burnt. 2dly, That it resembled corn, especially wheat, since it was

only when the wheat was putting forth the ear that these weeds were discovered. Now neither of these characters will suit *the tare*, which is excellent food for cattle, and sometimes cultivated for their use; and which, being a species of vetch, is distinguished from corn from the moment it appears above ground. Lightfoot observes that the Talmudic name answering to ζιξανιον is זונין *zonin*, which is probably formed from the Gr. and quotes this saying, *Triticum et zonin non sunt semina heterogenea.* Chr. remarks to the same purpose, ουκ αλλο τι σπερμα, αλλα ζιξανια καλει, ὁ και κατα την οψιν, εοικε πως τω σιτῳ, "he mentions no other weed but *zizania*, which, in its appearance, bears a resemblance to wheat." It may be remarked by the way, that Chr. speaks of it as a plant at that time known to every body. Now, as it cannot be *the tare* that is meant, it is highly probable that it is the *darnel*, in La. *lolium*, namely, that species called by botanists *temulentum*, which grows among corn, not the *lolium perenne*, commonly called *ray*, and corruptly *rye-grass*, which grows in meadows. For, 1st, this appears to have been the La. word by which the Gr. was wont to be interpreted. 2dly, It agrees to the characters above mentioned. It is a noxious weed; for when the seeds happen to be mingled and ground with the corn, the bread made of this mixture always occasions sickness and giddiness in those who eat it; and the straw has the same effect upon the cattle: it is from this quality, and the appearance of drunkenness which it produces, that it is termed *yvraie* in Fr. and has the specific name *temulentum* given it by botanists. And probably for the same reason it is called by Virgil, *infelix lolium.* It has also a resemblance to wheat sufficient to justify all that relates to this in the parable, or in the above quotations. By that saying, *non sunt semina heterogenea*, we are not to understand, with Lightfoot, that they are of the same genus, but that they are of the same class or tribe. Both are comprehended in the *gramina;* nay more, both terminate in a bearded spike, having the grains in two opposite rows. All the Fr. translations I have seen render it *yvraie.* Dio. *zizzanie*, which in the Vocabolario della Crusca, is explained by the La. *lolium.* Those who render it *cockle* are as far from the truth as the common version. The only Eng. translation in which I have found the word *darnel* is Mr. Wesley's.

32. *The smallest of all seeds ;* that is, of all those seeds with which the people of Judea were then acquainted. Our Lord's words are to be interpreted by popular use. And we learn from this Gospel, xvii. 20. that *like a grain of mustard seed* was become proverbial for expressing a very small quantity.

* *Becometh a tree.* That there was a species of the *sinapi*, or at least what the Orientals comprehended under that name, which rose to the size of a tree, appears from some quotations brought by Lightfoot and Buxtorf, from the writings of the Rabbies, men who will not be suspected of partiality, when their testimony happens to favour the writers of the N. T.

33. *Measures*, *σατα*. The word denotes a particular measure; but as we have none corresponding to it, and as nothing seems to depend on the quantity, I have, after our translators, used the general name, ch. v. 15. N.

35. *Things whereof all antiquity hath been silent*, *κεκρυμμενα απο καταβολης κοσμου*. E. T. *Things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world.* The Evangelist has not followed literally either the Heb. חידות מני קדם, or the version of the Seventy, *προβληματα απ' αρχης*, but has faithfully given the meaning. I have endeavoured to imitate him in this, attaching myself more to the sense than to the letter. This is in a more especial manner allowable in translating quotations from a poem. Diss. XII. P. I. § 10. As to the phrase *καταβολη κοσμου*, see ch. xxv. 34. N.

39. *Conclusion of this state*, *συντελεια του αιωνος*. E. T. *The end of the world ; αιων, state*, ch. xii. 32. N. I commonly render *τελος end*, *συντελεια conclusion.*

41. *All seducers*, *παντα σκανδαλα*. This term commonly denotes the actions or things which ensnare or seduce ; here it is the persons, being joined with *τους ποιουντας*, and is therefore rendered seducers.

48. *The useless*, *τα σαπρα*, ch. vii. 17. N.

52. *New things and old καινα και παλαια*. E. T. *Things new and old.* There is no ambiguity in the Gr. Each of the adjectives, by its gender and number, virtually expresses its own substantive. In the E. T. both adjectives *new* and *old* are construed with the same substantive *things*, though they do not relate to the same sub-

ject ; for *the new things* are certainly different from *the old.* Either therefore, the word *things* ought to be repeated, and it should be *things new,* and *things old ;* or the arrangement should be altered. If both adjectives immediately precede the noun or immediately follow, both are regarded as belonging to the same substantive, and ought to relate to the same subject. If the noun be placed after one of the adjectives, and before the other, it will be understood as belonging only to the first, and suggesting the repetition of the term after the second. In the present case, common sense secures us against mistake : but, if we do not avoid improprieties in plain cases, we have no security for escaping them, where they may perplex and mislead. See Phil. of Rhet. B. II. ch. vi. § II. P. II.

54. *Synagogue.* One MS. with the Vul. Sy. and Arm. versions reads *synagogues.*

55. *The carpenter's son,* ὁ του τεκτονος υἱος. Some affirm that all the evidence we have that Joseph was a *carpenter* is from tradition ; that the word used in the Gospels means *artificer* in genral, at least, one who works in wood, stone, or metal. I admit that the Gr. τεκτων answers nearly to the Lat. *faber,* which, according to the word accompanying it, as *lignarius, ferrarius, œrarius, eboris,* or *marmoris,* expresses different occupations. Thus, we have also, τεκτων ξυλων, σιδηρου, χαλκου, λιθων, for so many sorts of artificers. But there is no inconsistency in saying also, that when the word is used alone, it commonly denotes one of these occupations only, and not any of them indifferently. That this is actually the case with this word, in the usage of the sacred writers ; and that, when it is by itself, it implies *a carpenter,* may be proved by the following, amongst other passages in the Sep. 2 Ki. xxii. 6. 2 Chron. xxiv. 12. xxxiv. 11. Ezr. iii. 7. Is. xli. 7. Zech. i. 20. On the other hand, I have not found a single passage where it is employed in the same manner, to denote a man of a different occupation. There is something analogous, though the words are not equivalent, in the use of the word *smith* with us. It is employed in composition to denote almost every artificer in metal, the species being ascertained by the word compounded with it. Hence we have *goldsmith, silversmith, coppersmith, locksmith, gunsmith, blacksmith.* But if we use the word *smith,* simply, and without any thing connected to confine its signification, we always mean *blacksmith.*

55, 56. *Do not his brothers, James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas, and all his sisters live amongst us? οι αδελφοι αυτου Ιακωβος, και Ιωδης, και Σιμων, και Ιουδας και αι αδελφαι αυτου ουχι παδαι προς ημας εισι.* Upon reflection, it appears the more natural way of translating these two clauses, to make but one question of both.

[2] *Προς ημας.* Mr. vi. 3. N.

57. *They were scandalized at him, εσκανδαλιζοντο εν αυτω.* E. T. *They were offended in him.* This is one of the few instances in which the Eng. verb *scandalize*, expresses better the sense of the Gr. than any other in the language. To be *scandalized*, is to be offended on account of something supposed criminal or irreligious. This was the case here. Their knowledge of the meanness of our Lord's birth and education, made them consider him as guilty of an impious usurpation, in assuming the character of a Prophet, much more in aspiring to the title of the Messiah. The verb *to be offended*, does not reach the sense, and *to be offended in*, can hardly be said to express any thing, because not in the idiom of the tongue. Ch. v. 29. N.

CHAPTER XIV.

1. *Tetrarch, Τετραρχης.* Properly, the governor of the fourth part of a country; commonly used as a title inferior to *king*, and denoting chief ruler. The person here spoken of was Antipas, a son of Herod the Great. The name *king* is sometimes given to tetrarchs. See verse 9.

3. *His brother.* Sons of the same father, Herod the Great, by different mothers.

[2] *Philip's.* The name is not in the Vul. nor in the Cam. MS. It is in the Sax.

4. *It is not lawful for thee to have her.* As it appears from Josephus (Antiq. L. xviii. c. 7.) that this action was perpetrated during the life of her husband, it was a complication of the crimes of incest and adultery. There was only one case wherein a man might lawfully marry his brother's widow, which was, when he died childless. But Herodias had a daughter by her husband.

6. *But when Herod's birth-day was kept, γενεσιων δε αγομενων του Ηρωδου.* Some think, that by *γενεσια* is here meant the day of Herod's accession to his tetrarchy. The word may sometimes

be used with this latitude; but unless where there is positive evidence that it has that meaning, the safer way is to prefer the customary interpretation.

9. *The king was sorry, nevertheless, from a regard to his oath,* &c. In how dispassionate a manner, and with what uncommon candour does Mt. relate this most atrocious action! No exclamation! no exaggeration! no invective! There is no allowance, which even the friend of Herod would have urged in extenuation of his guilt, that this historian is not ready to make. *He was sorry, nevertheless, from a regard to his oath, and his guests*—The remark of Raphelius on the whole story is so pertinent, that I cannot avoid subjoining it: "Vide, quanta simplicitate rem narret, ne gra-"viori quidem verbo factum indignissimum notans. Neque hæc "aliter scribi opportuit. Ne quis igitur forsan imperitior ista asper-"netur, quasi crasso nimis filo, nulloque artificio, sint contexta: aliis "formis alia ornamenta conveniunt. Hanc, quam Matthæus ser-"moni suo induit, nativus maxime color, et nuda rerum expositio "honestat."

13. *By land,* πεξη. E. T. *On foot.* The Gr. word has unquestionably both significations. It means *on foot*, when opposed to *on horseback;* and *by land,* when contrasted with *by sea.*

15. *Towards the evening.* See verse 23. N.

19. *Blessed them,* ευλογησε. E. T. *He blessed.* With us, *to bless* is an active verb; and it may be asked, Whom, or what did he bless? The words in connexion lead us to apply it to the loaves. Thus, *He blessed, and brake, and gave the loaves.* Oriental use, however, would incline us to think that the meaning is, *blessed God;* that is, gave thanks to him. Thus, in the other miracle of the same kind, recorded in the next chapter, instead of ευλογησε, we have ευχαριστησας, *having given thanks.* See also Mr. viii. 6. J. vi. 11. The same thing takes place in the accounts given by the sacred writers of the last supper. What one calls ευλογησας another calls ευχαριστησας. This would make us suspect the terms to be synonymous. But as we find the word ευλογεω applied L. ix. 16. and 1 Cor. x. 16. to the things distributed, it is better here to give it the interpretation to which the construction evidently points. The Jews have, in their rituals, a prayer used on such occasions, which they call ברכה *brahach,*

that is, the *blessing* or *benediction*. It is probable, that no more was meant by either verb than that he said such a prayer.

23. *It was late.* It may appear strange to an ordinary reader, that the same phrase, *οψιας γενομενης*, is used, v. 15. to express the time when his disciples applied to him to dismiss the multitude, which was immediately before he fed them miraculously in the wilderness, and now after they had eaten and were dismissed, after the disciples were embarked, and had sailed half way over the sea of Galilee; and after he himself had retired to a mountain, and been occupied in prayer, the time is represented by the same phrase, *οψιας γενομενης*. Let it be observed, for the sake of removing this difficulty, that the Jews spoke of two evenings: the first was considered as commencing from *the ninth hour;* that is, in our reckoning *three o'clock afternoon;* the second from *the twelfth hour*, or *sunset*. This appears from several passages of the O. T. In the institution of the passover, for instance, the people are commanded (Ex. xii. 6.) to kill the lamb *in the evening*. The marginal reading, which is the literal version of the Heb. is *between the two evenings;* that is, between three and six o'clock afternoon. What is said, therefore, v. 15. denotes no more, than that it was about three; what is said here implies, that it was after sun-set. The attendant circumstances remove all ambiguity from the words. But as it was impossible to make this peculiarity in the idiom perspicuous in a translation, I have given, in the version, the import which the phrase has in the different places, and have added this explanation for the sake of the unlearned. Mr. xv. 42. N.

33. *A son of God, υιος θεου.* E. T. *The son of God.* In regard to the title *ὁ υιος του θεου*, which alone expresses definitely *the Son of God*, Mt. mentions it only once as given, by any man, to our Lord, before his resurrection; and that was in the memorable confession made by Peter, ch. xvi. 16. which gave occasion to a remarkable declaration and promise. It may be asked, Did not those mariners mean that our Lord was the Messiah, and, by consequence, more eminently than any other, *the Son of God?* It is not certain that this declaration implies their belief in him as the Messiah: they might intend only to say that he was a Prophet; for such are denominated sons of God: but supposing they meant the Messiah, we know too well the notions which at that time

obtained universally concerning the Messiah, as a temporal deliverer, to conclude that they annexed to the appellation, *Son of God*, aught of that peculiarity of character which Christians now do, on the best authority. If instead of *God*, we should say, *a God*, the version would be still more literal, and perhaps more just. Some think that those mariners were Pagans, of whom there was a great mixture in some places on the coasts of this lake. If they were, *the Son of a God* would be the proper expression of their meaning. Ch. xxvii. 54. N.

35. *That country*, *την περιχωρον εκεινην*. E. T. *That country round about*. Mr. i. 28. N.

CHAPTER XV.

1. *Of Jerusalem*, *απο Ιεροσολυμων*. That *απο*, before the name of a place, often denotes simply *of*, or *belonging to*, and not *from*, that place, many proofs might be brought from classical writers, as well as from sacred. Of the latter sort, the three examples following shall suffice: J. xi. 1. Acts xvii. 13. Heb. xiii. 24.

4. *Revileth*, *κακολογων*. E. T. *Curseth*. I am astonished that modern translators have so generally rendered the Gr. *κακολογειν*, by the word *to curse*, or some equivalent term. *To curse*, that is, to pray imprecations, is always expressed in the N. T. by *καταραθαι*, *αναθεματιζειν*, *καταναθεματιζειν*· *a curse*, by *καταρα*, *αναθεμα*, *καταναθεμα*; *cursed*, by *κατηραμενος* and *επικαταρατος*. The proper import of the word *κακολογειν* is *to give abusive language*, to revile, to calumniate. It may, indeed, be said justly, that *cursing*, as one species of abusive words, is also included. But it is very improper to confine a term of so extensive signification to this single particular. Nay more, the application, in the present instance, is evidently to reproachful words quite different from cursing. Our Lord, by quoting both the commandment and the denunciation against the opposite crime, has shown, that the Pharisees not only allowed the omission, but, in a certain case, prohibited the observance of the duty; nay, which is worse, made no account of the commission of a crime which, by the law, had been pronounced capital. First, They had devised for children an easy method of eluding the obligation to

maintain their indigent parents, which is implied in *the honour* enjoined by the precept; and, secondly, They made light of a man's treating his parent abusively, when they permitted him to say with impunity, "I devote whatever of mine shall profit thee;" which, though not properly cursing his parent, was threatening him, and venting an implicit imprecation against himself, that he might be held guilty of perjury and sacrilege, if ever he contributed to his support. This I take to be the κακολογια, the abuse, of which our Lord signifies, that, instead of being the means of releasing them from the observance of an express command of God, was itself a crime of the most heinous nature. The Heb. verb is קלל *kalal*, the signification of which is equally extensive with that of the Gr. and it has, in some places of the O. T. been as improperly rendered as the Gr. is in the N. In none, indeed, more remarkably than in Nehem. xiii. 25. where the inspired writer says only, *I reproached them*, our interpreters have, not very decently, made him say, *I cursed them*. The Heb. *kalal*, and the Gr. *cacologeo*, are both rightly rendered, by all the Lat. translators, *maledico*, a term exactly of the same import. But those Gr. words above quoted, which signify properly *to curse*, are rendered very differently by them all. For this purpose, they use *imprecor*, *execror*, *detestor*, *devoveo*, *diris ago*, and *anathematizo*. The verb καταραομαι, is only once in the Vul. translated *maledico*; and into this I imagine the translator has been led, by an inclination to verbal antithesis, which has often occasioned a greater deviation from the sense. *Benedicite maledicentibus vobis*. The only Eng. versions which I have seen, which render κακολογων *revileth*, are Wes.'s Wor.'s and Wa.'s. Sa. after the version of P. R. has well expressed the sense in Fr. by a periphrasis, *qui aura outragé de paroles*.

5. *I devote*. Mr. vii. 11. N.

* *Honour by his assistance*. Diss. XII. P. I. § 15.

8. *This people address me with their mouth, and honour me with their lips*. Εγγιζει μοι ὁ λαος ουτος τω στοματι αυτων, και τοις χειλεσι με τιμα. Vul. *Populus hic labiis me honorat*. There is nothing to answer to these words, εγγιζει μοι τω στοματι αυτων και: the like defect is in the Sy. the Cop. the Sax. the Eth. and the Arm. versions. The words are also wanting in three MSS. The passage in the prophecy quoted, is agreeable to the common reading.

9. *Institutions merely human, ενταλματα ανθρωπων.* E. T. *The commandments of men.* The word *ενταλμα* occurs but thrice in the N. T. namely here, in the parallel place, Mr. vii. 7. and in Col. ii. 22. In all these places it is joined with *ανθρωπων ;* as it is also in the passage of the Sep. here quoted. Moreover, in all these places, the *ενταλματα* are mentioned with evident disapprobation, and contrasted, by implication, with the precepts of God, which in the N. T. are never denominated *ενταλματα*, but *εντολαι.* For these reasons, I thought it more suitable to the original, to distinguish them in the version.

12. *Scandalized.* Ch. xiii. 57. N.

15. *Saying, παραβολην.* E. T. *Parable.* What Peter wanted to be explained, as the following words show, was that sentence, maxim, or proverb, which we have in v. 11. *It is not what goeth into the mouth*—This, on no principle, could be rendered *parable*, except that of Ar. of always translating the same word by the same word ; a principle which our interpreters have not often followed, in regard to this or any other term. Ch. xiii. 3. N.

17. *The sink.* Mr. vii. 19. N.

26. *To the dogs, τοις κυναριοις.* Our Lord, in this expression, did but adopt the common style of his countrymen the Jews, in relation to the Gentiles, to whom this woman belonged ; and he did this, evidently with a view to make the reflection, in v. 28. strike more severely against the former.

30, 31. *The cripple, κυλλους.* E. T. *maimed.* Though *maimed* is sometimes expressed by *κυλλος*, the Gr. word is not confined to this sense, but denotes equally one who wants a limb, and one who has not the use of it. In a relation, such as this, it ought to be rendered in its fullest latitude. Where the context shows it refers to one deprived of a member, as xviii. 8. it should be *maimed.* In v. 31. there is nothing in the Vul. Cop. Ara. Eth. and Sax. versions answering to *κυλλους υγιεις.*

32. *Lest their strength fail, μηποτε εκλυθωσιν.* E. T. *Lest they faint.* Vul. *Ne deficiant.* Be. more explicitly, *Ne viribus deficiant.* Cas. to the same purpose, *Ne defatiscantur.* None of these implies so much as the Eng. *to faint.* The Lat. phrase, cor-

responding to it, is *animi deliquium pati*. It appears, indeed, from several passages in the Bible, that when the common translation was made, the Eng. verb *to faint*, meant no more than what we should now express by the phrase, *to grow faint*, to become languid, to fail either in strength or resolution. See Josh. ii. 9. 24. Prov. xxiv. 10. Is. xl. 30, 31. L. xviii. 1. 2 Cor. iv. 16. Gal. vi. 9. Eph. iii. 13. Diss. XI. P. II. § 6.

37. *Maunds*, σπυριδας. Ch. xvi. 9, 10. N.

39. *Magdala*, Μαγδαλα. The Vul. *Magedan ;* in which it has the concurrence only of the Cam. MS. and of the Sax. version.

CHAPTER XVI.

1. *To try him*, πειραξοντες. E. T. *Tempting*. For the import of the Gr. word, see the note on ch. iv. 7. for there is here no difference in signification, between the simple πειραζω, and the compound εκπειραζω. An. substitutes for this word, *with a captious design*, and Wor. *Captiously*. These expressions neither give the sense, nor are in the spirit, of the Evangelist. I admit that it appears from the story, that those men were *captious*. It is certain, however, that the sacred writer does not call them so, but leaves us to collect it from the naked fact. Their putting questions to make trial of Jesus, did not of itself imply it ; that might have proceeded from the best of motives. The historian invariably preserves the same equable tenor, never betraying the smallest degree of warmth against any person, or attempting to prepossess the minds, or work upon the passions, of his readers. There are few mistakes so injurious to the original, as these infusions of a foreign temper.

3. Υποκριται. E. T. *Hypocrites*. But this word is not found in some of the most valuable MSS. Nor has it been in those copies from which the Vul. second Sy. Arm. Eth. and Sax. versions were made. Nor was it in the copies used by Chr.

8. *Distrustful*. Ch. vi. 30. 3.

9, 10. *Baskets—maunds*, κοφινους—σπυριδας. E. T. *Baskets —baskets*. In the relation formerly given of both miracles, and here, where our Lord recapitulates the principal circumstances of each, the distinction of the vessels employed for holding the frag-

ments is carefully marked. Now, though our words are not fit for answering entirely the same purpose with the original terms, which probably conveyed the idea of their respective sizes, and consequently of the quantity contained; still there is a propriety in marking, were it but this single circumstance, that there was a difference. *A maund* is a hand-basket. It is mentioned by Thevenot,* as used in the East. Harmer also takes notice of this circumstance, Obs. xxvi. Hence (according to Spelman) the term *Maundy-Thursday*, the name given to the *Thursday* before Easter; because annually, on that day, the king was wont to put into a *maund* or hand-basket, his alms to the poor. All the Lat. and foreign translations I have seen, ancient and modern, Lu.'s alone excepted, make the distinction, though their words are as ill adapted as ours. How it has been overlooked by all the Eng. translators, and, I had almost said, by them only, I cannot imagine.

13. *Who do men say that the Son of man is?* E. T. *Whom do men say that I the Son of Man am?* Our translators have been generally very attentive to grammatical correctness. Here they seem to have overlooked it, through attending more to the sound than to the construction of the words in Gr. and La. *Τινα με λεγουσιν οι ανθρωποι ειναι, τον υιον του ανθρωπου;* Vul. *Quem dicunt homines esse filium hominis?* It must be *τινα* and *quem*, as agreeing with *με* and *filium hominis* in the accusative, and connected with the substantive verb *ειναι*, and *esse* in the infinitive. Thus, we should say properly, in Eng. *Whom do they take me to be?* for the very same reason; *whom* agreeing with *me* in the accusative, and both suiting the verb *to be* in the infinitive. But in any of these languages, if the sentence be so construed as that the verb is in the indicative or the subjunctive mood, the pronouns must be in the nominative. We say, *Who* (not *whom*) *is he?* for the same reason that we should say, *Quis* (not *quem*) *est hic;* or *τις* (not *τινα*) *εστιν ουτος*. I should not have thought this grammatical criticism worth making, had I not observed that the most of our late translators had, I suppose, through mere inattention, implicitly followed the manner of the Eng. interpreters.

2 *That the Son of Man is?* E. T. *That I the Son of Man am?* This is conformable to the common reading. The *με*, however,

* Travels, part I. b. II. ch. xxiv.

was not found in any of the copies used by Jerom. The Vul. Ara. Sax. Cop. and Eth. versions, have no word corresponding to it. Besides, it is unsuitable to the style of the Gospels. In no other passage, where our Lord calls himself *the Son of Man*, does he annex the personal pronoun, or express himself in the first person, but in the third.

18. *Thou art named Rock ; and on this rock*, συ ει Πετρος, και επι ταυτη τη πετρα— E. T. *Thou art Peter ; and upon this rock*— But here the allusion to the name, though specially intended by our Lord, is totally lost. There was a necessity, therefore, in Eng. in order to do justice to the declaration made, to depart a little from the letter. I say in Eng. because in several languages, Lat. Itn. and Fr. for instance, as well as in Sy. and Gr. the name, without any change, shows the allusion.

[2] *The gates of hades.* Diss. VI. P. II. § 17.

19. *Whatever thou shalt bind—whatever thou shalt loose*— Ch. xviii. 18. N.

20. The name *Jesus* is wanting in many MSS. and some ancient versions.

21. *Began to discover*, ηρξατο δεικνυειν. Mr. v. 17. N.

22. *Taking him aside*, προσλαβομενος αυτον. E. T. *Took him and*—This expression is quite indefinite. Some render the words, *embraced him ;* others, *took him by the hand.* I can discover no authority for either. To take aside evidently suits the meaning which the verb has in other places. In Acts xviii. 26. it cannot be interpreted otherwise. And even in other parts of that book, where the word is used to denote the admission or reception of converts, this sense may be said to be included. An admission into the church was, in several respects, a separation from the world.

[2] *Reproved him*, ηρξατο επιτιμαν αυτω. Some interpreters, to put the best face on Peter's conduct on this occasion, render the words thus, *Began to expostulate with him.* To translate the verb in this manner, is going just as far to an extreme on one hand, as to translate it *threaten* is going on the other. Mr. ix. 25. N. It cannot be questioned, that when the verb επιτιμαν relates to any thing past, it always implies a declaration of censure or blame : and if it be thought that this would infer great presumption in Peter,

it may be asked, Does not the rebuke which he drew on himself, v. 23. from so mild a Master, evidently infer as much? When we consider the prejudices of the disciples, in regard to the nature of the Messiah's kingdom, we cannot be much surprised that a declaration, such as that in v. 21. totally subversive of all their hopes, should produce, in a warm temper, as great impropriety of behaviour as (admitting the ordinary interpretation of the word) Peter was then chargeable with.

[3] *God forbid*, ἱλεως σοι. E. T. *Be it far from thee.* In the common use of this phrase in the Sep. it answers exactly to a Heb. word signifying *absit*, *God forbid.* It is thus also rendered in the common version. See 1 Sam. xiv. 45. 1 Chron. xi. 19. In the Apocrypha the use is the same. Thus, 1 Mac. ii. 21. ἱλεως ἡμιν καταλιπειν νομον και δικαιωματα is justly rendered in the common version, *God forbid that we should forsake the law and the ordinances.* In most other places it is translated *far be it.* The sense is the same.

23. *Adversary*, Σατανα. Diss. VI. P. I. § 5.

[2] *Obstacle*, σκανδαλον. Ch. v. 29. N.

24. *If any man will come*, ει τις θελει ελθειν. Dod. and others, *If any one is willing to come.* I acknowledge that the Eng. verb *will* does not always reach the full import of the Gr. θελειν: as *will* with us is sometimes no more than a sign of the future, it does not necessarily suggest volition. But this example does not fall under the remark. In a case like the present, if no more than the futurity of the event were regarded, the auxiliary ought to be *shall*, and not *will*, as thus, 'If it shall be fair weather to-morrow, 'I will go to such a place.' 'If he shall call on me, I will remind 'him of his engagement.' In fact, to say 'if any man be *willing* 'to come' is to say less than 'if any man *will* come.' The former expresses only a present inclination, the latter a resolution strong enough to be productive of its effect. But when put in the form of a question, it is equally good either way. L. xiii. 31. N. J. vii. 17. N.

[2] *Under my guidance*, οπισω μου. E. T. *After me.* But the Eng. phrase to come after one, means quite another thing.

26. *With the forfeit of his life*, την δε ψυχην ζημιωθη. E. T. *Lose his own soul.* *Forfeit* comes nearer the import of the ori-

ginal word, which Dod. has endeavoured to convey by a circumlocution, *Should be punished with the loss of his life.* But the chief error in the E. T. lies in changing, without necessity, the word answering to ψυχη, calling it, in the preceding verse, *life*, and in this *soul.* The expressions are proverbial, importing, 'It signifies nothing how much a man gain, if it be at the expense of his life.' That our Lord has a principal eye to the loss of the soul, or of eternal life, there can be no doubt. But this sentiment is couched under a proverb, which, in familiar use, concerns only the present life. That ψυχη is susceptible of both meanings is beyond a question.

[3] *Not give.* Mr. viii. 37. N.

28. *Shall not taste death.* *To taste death*, and *to see death*, are common Hebraisms for *to die.*

[1] *Enter upon his reign;* to wit, by the miraculous displays of his power, and the success of his doctrine.

CHAP. XVII.

1. *Apart*, κατ' ιδιαν. As this adverbial expression immediately follows ορος ὑψηλον, some have thought that it refers to the situation of the mountain, as standing by itself, far from other mountains, and have thence concluded that the mountain meant was *Tabor* in Galilee, which exactly fits this description, being of a conical figure, surrounded by a plain (Maundrel's Travels.) But it is more agreeable to the ordinary application of the words κατ' ιδιαν, to interpret them as denoting the privacy of persons, in particular transactions, and not the situation of places.

2. *As the light*, ὡς το φως. Vul. *Sicut nix.* The Cam. ὡς χιων. The Eth. and Sax. versions are the only other authorities for this reading.

4. *Booths*, σκηνας. E. T. *Tabernacles.* The word σκηνη denotes not only what we properly call *a tabernacle*, or moveable wooden house, and *a tent*, which is also a sort of portable house, consisting of either cloth or skins, extended on a frame, and easily put up or taken down, but also a temporary *shed* or *booth*, made of the branches of trees, which abounded in the mountainous parts of Judea, where the materials proper for rearing either *tent* or *tabernacle* could not be found on a sudden. It was of such branches that

they reared booths for themselves on *the feast of tabernacles*, which would be more properly styled *the feast of booths*, if changing the name of a festival did not savour of affectation.

11. *To consummate the whole*, και αποκαταστησει παντα. E. T. *And restore all things.* The original sense of the verb αποκαθιστημι is, *instauro, redintegro, I begin anew.* It is most properly applied to the sun and planets, and in regard to which the finishing and the recommencing of their course are coincident. Besides, their return to the place whence they set out, does, as it were, restore the face of things to what it was at the beginning of their circuit. Hence the word has got two meanings, which, on reflection, are more nearly related than at first they appear to be. One is *to restore*, the other *to finish.* In both senses the word was applicable to the Baptist, who came as a reformer to re-establish that integrity from which men had departed. He came also as the last prophet of the old dispensation, to finish that state of things, and usher in a new one. When it is followed, as in the text, by so comprehensive a word as παντα, without any explanation, it must be understood in the sense of finishing. When the meaning is to restore, there never fails to be some addition made, to indicate the state to which, or the person to whom, the restoration is made. See ch. xii. 13. Mr. iii. 5. viii. 25. L. vi. 10. Acts, i. 6. Heb. xiii. 19. But when the meaning is to finish, no addition is requisite. In the present instance, he shall restore all things, is, to say the least, a very definite expression. This remark must be extended to the verbal noun αποκαταστασις, which, when similarly circumstanced, ought to be rendered *completion, consummation*, or *accomplishment*, not restoration, re-establishment, or restitution. In Acts iii. 21. Peter says, concerning our Lord, as it stands in the common version, *Whom the heaven must receive, until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets, since the world began.* To me it is manifest that these words, *the restitution of all things which God hath spoken by his prophets*, convey no meaning at all. Substitute *accomplishment* for *restitution*, and there remains not a vestige either of difficulty or of impropriety, in the sentence. I have chosen the verb *to consummate*, in the present instance, as it conveys somewhat of both the senses of αποκαθιστημι. It denotes, to render perfect, which coincides

with the reformation or restoration to integrity, he was sent to promote, and also *to conclude*, or finish, the Mosaic economy. All the La. and most other modern translators, have implicitly followed the Vul. which renders it *restituet*. Several Eng. interpreters have varied a little, and given at least a more definite sense, some saying *regulate all things*, others, *set all things right*. But some of the Oriental versions, particularly the Sy. and the Per. render it as I have done.

15. *Lunacy*. This man's disease we should, from the symptoms, call *epilepsy*, rather than *lunacy*. But I did not think it necessary to change the name, as the circumstances mentioned sufficiently show the case, whilst the appellation given it (σεληνιαζεται) shows the general sentiments at that time, concerning the moon's influence on this sort of malady.

21. *This kind is not dispossessed.* Mr. ix. 29. N.

22. *Is to be delivered up*, μελλει παραδιδοσθαι. In my notion of the import of this compound future, there is much the same difference between παραδοθησεται and μελλει παραδιδοσθαι in Gr. as there is between the phrases *will be delivered* and *is to be delivered* in Eng. The latter gives a hint of the nearness of the event, which is not suggested by the author. Ch. iii. 7. N.

24. *The didrachma ;* a tribute exacted for the support of the temple, from which Jesus, as being the Son of God, whose house the temple was, ought to have been exempted.

CHAPTER XVIII.

3. *Unless ye be changed*, εαν μη στραφητε. E. T. *Except ye be converted.* But the Eng. term *to convert*, denotes always one or other of these two things, either to bring over from infidelity to the profession of the true religion, or to recover from a state of impenitence to the love and obedience of God. Neither of these appears to be the meaning of the world here. The only view is, to signify that they must lay aside their ambition and wordly pursuits, before they be honoured to be the members, much more the ministers, of that new establishment, or kingdom, he was about to erect. Cas. renders it

very properly *nisi mutati fueritis*, and has in this been followed by some Fr. translators.

6. *An upper millstone, μυλος ονικος.* E. T. *A millstone.* All the La. translators have rendered it *mola asinaria*, a millstone turned by an ass. All the foreign translations I have seen, adopt this interpretation. That given by Phavorinus appears to me preferable. He explains *μυλος ονικος the upper millstone. Ονος* alone was a common name for the *upper*, as *μυλη* was for the *nether* millstone. *Μυλος* might denote either. Sometimes an adjective was joined to *ονος*, when used in this sense, to prevent ambiguity. Xenophon calls it *ονος αλετης*. In the same way it appears that Mt. adds to *μυλος*, *millstone*, the epithet *ονικος*, to express the *upper*. I own that, in the version, the last mentioned term, after the example of other Eng. translators, might have been dropt, as not affecting the import of the sentence. But as Mr. has employed a different phrase, *λιθος μυλινος*, which expresses the thing more generally, I always endeavour, if possible, that the Gospels may not appear, in the translation, more coincident, in style and manner, than they are in the original.

7. *Wo unto the world.* L. vi. 24, 25, 26. N.

10. *Their angels.* It was a common opinion, among the Jews, that every person had a guardian angel assigned to him.

12. *Will he not leave the ninety-nine upon the mountains, and go. ουχι αφεις τα εννενηκονταεννεα επι τα ορη πορευθεις.* E. T. *Doth he not leave the ninety and nine, and goeth into the mountains.* Vul. *Nonne relinquit nonagintanovem in montibus, et vadit.* The Sy. to the same purpose. The Gr. is susceptible of either interpretation, according as we place the comma before, or after, *επι τα ορη*. The parallel passage, L. xv. 4. which has no ambiguity, decides the question. What is here called *ορη* is there *ερημος*. Both terms signify a hilly country, fitter for pasture than for agriculture. Mr. i. 3. N.

17. *Acquaint the congregation with it, ειπε τη εκκλησια.* E. T. *Tell it to the church.* I know no way of reaching the sense of our Lord's instructions, but by understanding his words so as they must have been understood, by his hearers, from the use that then prevailed. The word *εκκλησια* occurs frequently in the Sep. and is that

by which the Heb קהל *kahal* is commonly translated. That word we find used in two different, but related senses, in the O. T. One is for a whole nation, considered as constituting one commonwealth or polity. In this sense the people of Israel are denominated πασα ἡ εκκλησια Ισραελ, and πασα ἡ εκκλησια Θεου. The other is for a particular *congregation* or *assembly*, either actually convened, or accustomed to convene, in the same place. In this sense it was applied to those who were wont to assemble in any particular synagogue; for every synagogue had its own εκκλησια. And as the word συναγωγη was sometimes employed to signify, not the house, but the people; those two Gr. words were often used promiscuously. Now as the nature of the thing sufficiently shows that our Lord, in this direction, could not have used the word in the first of the two senses above given, and required that every private quarrel should be made a national affair, we are under a necessity of understanding it in the last, as regarding the particular congregation to which the parties belonged. What adds great probability to this, as Lightfoot and others have observed, is the evidence we have that the like usage actually obtained in the synagogue, and in the primitive church. Whatever foundation, therefore, there may be, from those books of Scripture that concern a later period, for the notion of a church representative; it would be contrary to all the rules of criticism, to suppose that our Lord used this term in a sense wherein it could not then be understood by any one of his hearers; or that he would say *congregation*, for so the word literally imports, when he meant only a few heads or directors. L. Cl. renders this passage in the same manner, *dites le a l' assemble*. But in ch. xvi. 18. where our Lord manifestly speaks of all, without exception, who, to the end of the world, should receive him as the Messiah, the Son of the living God, I have retained the *church*, as being there perfectly unequivocal. Simon, in effect, gives the same explanation to this verse, that I do: for, though he retains the word *eglise* in the version, he explains it in a note, as importing no more than the particular assembly or congregation to which the parties belong.

18. *Whatsoever ye shall bind*, ὁσα εαν δησητε. The promise made especially to Peter, ch. xvi. 19. is made here to all the apostles. It is with them our Lord is conversing through the whole of this chapter. The Jewish phraseology seems to warrant the expla-

nation of *binding* and *loosing*, by *prohibiting* and *permitting*. The connexion here would more naturally lead us to intrepret it, of *condemning* and *absolving*, thus making it a figurative expression of what is spoken plainly, J. xx. 23. *Whose sins soever ye remit, they are remitted to them ; and whose sins soever ye retain, they are retained.* It is not impossible that, under the figure of *binding* and *loosing*, both may be comprehended. It is a good rule, in doubtful cases, to translate literally, though obscurely, rather than to run the hazard of mistranslating, by confining an expression to a meaning of which we are doubtful whether it was the author's.

23. *The administration of heaven, ἡ βασιλεια των ουρανων.* Diss. V. P. I. § 7.

25. *That he, and his wife, and children, and all that he had, should be sold.* A custom, for the satisfaction of creditors, which, how cruel soever we justly account it, was, in early ages, established by the laws of many countries, in Europe, as well as in Asia, republican, as well as monarchical.

29. *I will pay thee.* The common Gr. adds *παντα, all.* But this word is not found in many MSS. several of them of principal note, nor in some ancient versions and editions. Mill and Wetstein have both thought proper to reject it.

34. *To the jailors, τοις βασανισταις.* E. T. *To the tormentors.* The word *βασανιστης* properly denotes *examiner*, particularly one who has it in charge to *examine by torture.* Hence it came to signify *jailor*, for on such, in those days, was this charge commonly devolved. They were not only allowed, but even commanded, to treat the wretches in their custody, with every kind of cruelty, in order to extort payment from them, in case they had concealed any of their effects ; or, if they had nothing, to wrest the sum owed, from the compassion of their relations and friends, who, to release an unhappy person, for whom they had a regard, from such extreme misery, might be induced to pay the debt ; for, let it be observed, that the person of the insolvent debtor was absolutely in the power of the creditor, and at his disposal.

35. *Who forgiveth not from his heart the faults of his brother. εαν μη αφητε εκαστος τω αδελφω αυτου απο των καρδιων υμων τα παραπτωματα αυτων.* There is nothing in the Vul. answering

to the three last words. The same may be said of the Ara. the Cop. the Sax. and the Eth. versions. They are wanting also in the Cam. and three other MSS.

CHAPTER XIX.

1. *Upon the Jordan.* Ch. iv. 15. N.

4. *When the Creator made man, he formed a male and a female,* ὁ ποιησας, αρσεν και θηλυ εποιησεν αυτους. E. T. *He which made them, made them male and female.* But they could not have translated the clause differently, if the Gr. expression had been αρρενας και θηλειας εποιησεν αυτους. Yet it is manifest that the sense would have been different. All that this declaration would have implied is, that when God created mankind, he made people of both sexes. But what argument could have been drawn from this principle to show that the tie of marriage was indissoluble? Or how could the conclusion annexed have been supported? *For this cause a man shall leave father and mother*—Besides, it was surely unnecessary to recur to the history of the creation, to convince those Pharisees of what all the world knew, that the human race was composed of men and women, and consequently of two sexes. The weight of the argument, therefore, must lie in this circumstance, that God created at first no more than a single pair, one of each sex, whom he united in the bond of marriage, and, in so doing, exhibited a standard of that union to all generations. The very words, *and these two,* show that it is implied in the historian's declaration, that they were two, one male and one female, and no more. But this is by no means implied in the common version. It lets us know, indeed, that there were two sexes, but gives us no hint that there were but two persons. Unluckily, Eng. adjectives have no distinction of number; and through this imperfection, there appears here, in all the Eng. translations I have seen, something inconclusive in the reasoning, which is peculiar to them. In our idiom, an adjective, construed with the pronoun *them,* or indeed with any plural noun or pronoun, is understood to be plural. There is, therefore, a necessity, in a case like this, if we would do justice to the original, that the defect, occasioned by our want of inflections, be supplied, by giving the sentence such a turn as will fully express the sense. This

end is here easily effected, as the words *male* and *female*, in our language, may be used either adjectively or substantively. And when they are used as substantives, they are susceptible of the distinction of number.

5. *They two shall be one flesh*, εσονται οι δυο εις σαρκα μιαν. This is a quotation from Gen. ii. 24. in which place it deserves our notice, that there is no word answering to *two* in the present Masoretic editions of the Heb. Bible. But, on the other hand, it ought to be observed that the Samaritan copies have this word, that the Sep. reads exactly as the Gospel does. So do also the Vul. the Sy. and the Ara. versions of the O. T. It has been observed of this passage, that it is four times quoted in the N. T. to wit, here, in Mr. x. 8. 1 Cor. vi. 16. and Eph. v. 31. and in none of them is the word δυο wanting. The only ancient version, of any consideration, wherein it is not found, is the Chaldee. But with regard to it, we ought to remember, that as the Jewish Rabbies have made greater use of it, in their synagogues and schools, than of any other version, they have had it in their power to reduce it, and in fact have reduced it, to a much closer conformity, than any other, to the Heb. of the Masorets. It is well known how implicitly the Rabbies are followed by their people. And they could not have adopted a more plausible rule than that the translation ought to be corrected by the original. But as there can be no doubt about the authenticity of the reading in the N. T. I think, for the reasons above named, there is the greatest ground to believe, that the ancient reading in the O. T. was the same with this of the New.

7. *Why did Moses command to give a writing of divorcement, and dismiss her?* By the manner in which they put the question, one would imagine that Moses had commanded both, to wit, the dismission and the writing of divorcement; whereas, in fact, he had only permitted the dismission; but in case they should use the permission given them, commanded the writing of divorcement.

8. *Untractable disposition*, σκληροκαρδιαν. Diss. IV. § 22.

12. *Let him act this part who can act it*, ὁ δυναμενος χωρειν, χωρειτω. E. T. *He that is able to receive it, let him receive it.* This expression is rather dark and indefinite. Χωρειν, amongst other things, signifies, *to receive, to admit, to be capable of.* It

is applied equally to things speculative, and, in that case, denotes, *to understand, to comprehend;* and to things practical, in which case it denotes, *to resolve*, and *to execute*. Every body must perceive that the reference here is to the latter of these.

13. *Lay his hands upon them and pray.* It appears to have been customary among the Jews, when one prayed for another who was present, to lay his hand upon the person's head.

17. *Why callest thou me good?* Τι με λεγεις αγαθον Vul. *Quid me interrogas de bono?* Five MSS. read, in conformity to the Vul. Τι με ερωτας περι του αγαθου; With this agree also the Cop. the Arm. the Sax. and the Eth. versions. This reading is likewise approved by Origen, and some other ancients after him, and also by some moderns, amongst whom are Er. Gro. Mill, and Ben. The other reading is, nevertheless, in my opinion, preferable, on more accounts than one. Its evidence, from MSS. is beyond comparison superior; the versions on both sides may nearly balance each other: but the internal evidence arising from the simplicity and connexion of the thoughts, is entirely in favour of the common reading. Nothing can be more pertinent than to say, 'If you believe that God alone is good, why do you call me so?' whereas nothing can appear less pertinent than, 'If you believe that God alone is good, why do you consult me concerning the good that you must do?'

[2] *That life*, την ζωην, Diss. X. P. V. § 2.

20. *The young man replied, All these I have observed from my childhood.* Λελει αυτω ὁ νεανισκος, Παντα ταυτα εφυλαξαμην εκ νεοτητος μου. E. T. *The young man saith unto him, All these things have I kept from my youth up.* As he was a young man who made this reply, the import of νεοτης must be *childhood*, as relating to an earlier stage of life, and is, therefore, badly rendered *youth*.

23. *It is difficult for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven.* By *the kingdom of heaven* is sometimes understood in this history, the Christian church, then soon to be erected, and sometimes the state of the blest in heaven, after the resurrection. In regard to this declaration of our Lord, I take it to hold true, in which way soever the kingdom be understood. When it was only by means of persuasion that men were brought into a society, hated and persecuted by all the ruling powers of the earth, Jewish and Pagan; we

may rest assured that the opulent and the voluptuous (characters which, in a dissolute age, commonly go together), who had so much to lose, and so much to fear, would not, among the hearers of the Gospel, be the most easily persuaded. The Apostle James, ii. 5, 6. accordingly attests this to have been the fact; *it was the poor in this world whom God hath chosen rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom;* whereas, they were *the rich in this world who oppressed them, dragged them before their tribunals, and blasphemed that worthy name by which they were called.* As little can there be any doubt of the justness of the sentiment, in relation to the state of the blessed hereafter, when the deceitfulness of riches, and the snare into which it so often inveigles men, are duly considered. So close an analogy runs through all the divine dispensations, that, in more instances than this, it may be affirmed with truth that the declarations of Scripture are susceptible of either interpretation.

24. *A camel*, καμηλον. The. observes, that some explain the word as signifying here *a cable*. A good authority, however, for signification, though adopted by Cas. who says, *rudentem*, I have never seen. The frequency of the term, amongst all sorts of writers, for representing the beast so denominated, is undeniable. Besides, *the camel*, being the largest animal they were acquainted with in Judea, its name was become proverbial for denoting any thing remarkably large, and *a camel's passing through a needle's eye*, came by consequence, as appears from some rabbinical writings, to express a thing absolutely impossible. Among the Babylonians, in whose country *elephants* were not uncommon, the phrase was *an elephant's passing through a needle's eye;* but the elephant was a stranger in Judea.

[2] *To pass through the eye of a needle*, δια τρυπηματος ραφιδος διελθειν. A great number of MSS. some of the most valuable, though neither the Al. nor the Cam. instead of διελθειν read εισελθειν, *enter*. Agreeable to this are both the Sy. the Cop. Eth. and Ara. versions. The Vul. and other versions follow the common reading. Should the external evidence appear balanced on both sides, the common reading is preferable, as yielding a better sense. Passing through a needle's eye is the circumstance in which the impossibility lies. There was no occasion for suggesting whither. There is even something odd in the suggestion, which is very unlike the manner of this author. Wet. adopts the alteration.

28. *That, at the renovation, when the Son of Man shall be seated on his glorious throne, ye, my followers, sitting also upon twelve thrones, shall judge,* ὁτι ὑμεις οι ακολουθησαντες μοι, εν τη παλιγγενεσια, ὁταν καθισῃ ὁ ὑιος του ανθρωπου επι θρονου δοξης αυτου, καθισεσθε και ὑμεις επι δωδεκα θρονους, κρινοντες. E. T. *Ye which have followed me in the regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye shall also sit upon twelve thrones, judging.* In regard to which version, two things occur to be observed; 1st, That εν τη παλιγγενεσια (in which there is an ambiguity, as was remarked in Diss. XII. P. I. § 22.) is rendered, as though it belonged to the preceding clause, ακολουθησαντες μοι, whereas the scope of the passage requires, that it be construed with the clause which follows it. 2dly, That the word παλιγγενεσια is, in this place, better translated *renovation.* We are accustomed to apply the term *regeneration* solely to the conversion of individuals; whereas its relation here is to the general state of things. As they were wont to denominate *the creation*, γενεσις, a remarkable restoration, or *renovation*, of the face of things, was very suitably termed παλιγγενεσια. The return of the Israelites to their own land, after the Babylonish captivity, is so named by Josephus, the Jewish historian. What was said on verse 23. holds equally in regard to the promise we have here. The principal completion will be at the general resurrection, when there will be, in the most important sense, *a renovation*, or *regeneration* of heaven and earth, when all things shall become new; yet, in a subordinate sense, it may be said to have been accomplished when God came to visit, in judgment, that guilty land; when the old dispensation was utterly abolished, and succeeded by the Christian dispensation, into which the Gentiles, from every quarter, as well as Jews, were called and admitted.

CHAPTER XX.

1. This chapter, in the original, begins, Ὁμοια γαρ. The γαρ shows manifestly that what follows was spoken in illustration of the sentence with which the preceding chapter concludes, and which, therefore, ought not to have been disjoined from this parable. The

Vul. has no particle answering to *γαρ*. In that version the chapter begins thus, *Simile est regnum cœlorum*. But this does not seem to have sprung from a different reading, as there is no diversity here in the Gr. MSS. nor, for aught I can learn, in ancient translations. I rather think that the omission has happened after the division into chapters, and has arisen from a notion of the impropriety of beginning a chapter with the casual particle. It adds to the probability of this, that several old La. MSS. have the conjunction as well as the Gr.

2. *The administration.* Diss. V. P. I. § 7.

6. *Unemployed*, *αργους*, wanting in the Cam. and 2 other MSS. not in the Vul. Sax. and Cop. versions.

7. *And ye shall receive what is reasonable*, *και ο εαν η δικαιον ληψεσθε*. This clause is wanting in the Cam. and two other MSS. And there is nothing answering to it in the Vul. and Sax. versions.

13. *Friend*, *εταιρε*. Diss. XII. P. I. § 11.

15. *May not I do what I will with my own?* *ουκ εξεστι μοι ποιησαι ο θελω εν τοις εμοις;* Vul. *Non licet mihi quod volo facere?* Here there is no translation of the words *εν τοις εμοις*, though of manifest importance to the sense. There is the same defect in the Sax. and Arm. versions, but not in any Gr. MS. that has yet appeared, nor in any other translation.

22. *Undergo an immersion like that which I must undergo*, *το βαπτισμα ο εγω βαπτιζομαι βαπτισθηναι*. E. T. *To be baptised with the baptism that I am baptised with.* The primitive signification of *βαπτισμα* is *immersion*, of *βαπτιζειν*, *to immerse*, *plunge*, or *overwhelm*. The noun ought never to be rendered *baptism*, nor the verb *to baptise*, but when employed in relation to a religious ceremony. The verb *βαπτιζειν* sometimes, and *βαπτειν*, which is synonymous, often occurs in the Sep. and Apocryphal writings, and is always rendered in the common version by one or other of these words, *to dip*, *to wash*, *to plunge*. When the original expression, therefore, is rendered in familiar language, there appears nothing harsh or extraordinary in the metaphor. Phrases like these, to be overwhelmed with grief, to be immersed in affliction, will be found common in most languages.

It is proper here farther to observe, that the whole of this clause, and that corresponding to it, in the subsequent verse, are in this Gospel wanting in the Vul. and several MSS. As they are found, however, in the far greater number both of ancient versions, and of MSS. and perfectly coincide with the scope of the passage, I did not think there was weight enough in what might be urged, on the opposite side, to warrant the omission of them ; neither indeed does Wet. But Gro. and Mill are of the contrary opinion.

23. *I cannot give, unless to those,* ουκ εστιν εμον δουναι, αλλ' οις. E. T. *Is not mine to give ; but it shall be given to them.* The conjunction αλλα, when, as in this place, it is not followed by a verb, but by a noun or pronoun, is generally to be understood as of the same import with ει μη, *nisi, unless, except,* Otherwise, the verb must be supplied, as is done here, in the common version. But as such an ellipsis is uncommon, recourse ought not to be had to it without necessity. Of the interpretation I have given of the conjunction αλλα, we have an example, Mr. ix. 8. compared with Mt. xvii. 8. Vul. *Non est meum dare vobis.* See Mr. x. 40. N.

26. *Servant,* διακονος. E. T. *Minister.* 27 *Slave,* δουλος. E. T. *Servant.* In the proper and primitive sense of διακονος, it is a *servant* who attends his master, waits on him at table, and is always near his person, to obey his orders, which was accounted a more creditable kind of service. By the word δουλος is not only meant *a servant* in general (whatever kind of work he be employed in,) but also *a slave.* It is solely from the scope and connexion that we must judge, when it should be rendered in the one way, and when in the other. In the passage before us, the view in both verses is to signify, that the true dignity of the Christian will arise more from the service he does to others, than the power he possesses over them. We are to judge, therefore, of the value of the words from the import of those they are contrasted with. And as desiring to be *great* is a more moderate ambition than desiring to be *chief,* we naturally conclude, that as the word opposed to the former should be expressive of some of the inferior stations in life, that opposed to the latter must be expressive of the lowest. When this sufficiently suits the ordinary signification of the words, there

can hardly remain any doubt. As this is manifestly the case here, I did not know any words in our language by which I could better express a difference in degree, so clearly intended, than the words *servant* and *slave*. The word *minister*, is now appropriated to the servants, not of private masters, but of the public. It is from the distinctions in private life, well known at the time, that our Lord's illustrations are borrowed.

31. *Charged them to be silent*, επετιμησεν αυτοις ινα σιωπησωσιν. E. T. *Rebuked them, because they should hold their peace.* The historian surely did not mean to blame the poor men for their importunity. Our Lord, on the contrary, commends such importunity, sometimes expressly in words, and always by making the application successful. But to render *ινα because*, appears quite unexampled. It answers commonly to the La. *ut*, sometimes to *ita ut*, but never, as far as I remember, to *quia*. It is rendered *ut* in this passage in all the La. versions. The import of *ινα* ascertains the sense of επιτιμαω, which is frequently translated *to charge*, even in the common version. In proof of this, several places might be produced : but I shall only refer the reader to the parallel passage in Mr. x. 48. where επετιμων αυτω πολλοι ινα σιωπηση is translated, *Many charged him that he should hold his peace ;* and to Mr. ix. 25. N.

CHAPTER XXI.

4. *Now all this was done, that the words of the prophet might be fulfilled,* τουτο δε ολον γεγονεν, ινα πληρωθη το ρηθεν δια του προφητου. Our Lord's perfect knowledge of all that the prophets had predicted concerning him, gives a propriety to this manner of rendering these words, when every thing is done by his direction, which it could not have in any other circumstances.

5. *The daughter of Zion*, that is, *Jerusalem*, so named from Mount Zion, which was in the city, and on which was erected a fortress for its defence. This poetical manner of personifying the cities and countries, to which they addressed themselves, was familiar to the prophets.

[2] From the other Evangelists it would appear, that our Lord rode only on the colt ; from this passage, we should be apt to think

that both had been used. But it is not unusual with the sacred authors, when either the nature of the thing spoken of, or the attendant circumstances, are sufficient for precluding mistakes, to employ the plural number for the singular.

7. *Covering them with their mantles,* επεθηκαν επανω αυτων τα ἱματια αυτων. The Sy. interpreter, either from a different reading in the copies he used, or (which is more likely) from a desire to express the sense more clearly, has rendered it *they laid their mantles on the colt.*

9. *Blessed be he that cometh,* ευλογημενος ὁ ερχομενος. E. T. *Blessed is he that cometh.* But acclamations of this kind are always of the nature of prayers, or ardent wishes; like the Fr. *vive le roy,* or our *God save the king.* Nay, the words connected are entirely of this character. *Hosanna to the Son of David,* is equivalent to *God preserve the Son of David;* and consequently what follows is the same as *prosperous be the reign of him that cometh in the name of the Lord.*

[a] *In the highest heaven.* L. ii. 14. N.

12. *The temple,* το ἱερον. Let it be observed that the word here is not ναος. By the latter, was meant properly *the house,* including only the vestibule, the holy place or sanctuary, and the most holy. Whereas the former comprehended all the courts. It was in the outermost court that this sort of traffic was exercised. For want of peculiar names in European languages, these two are confounded in most modern translations. To the ναος, or temple, strictly so called, none of those people had access, not even our Lord himself, because not of the posterity of Aaron. L. i. 9. N. It may be thought strange that the Pharisees, whose sect then predominated, and who much affected to patronize external decorum in religion, should have permitted so gross a violation of decency. But, let it be remembered that the merchandize was transacted in the court of the Gentiles, a place allotted for the devotions of the proselytes of the gate, those who having renounced idolatry, worshipped the true God, but did not subject themselves to circumcision and the ceremonial law. To the religious service of such, the narrow-souled Pharisees paid no regard. The place they did not account holy. It is even not improbable that in order to put an indignity on those half-conformists, they have introduced, and promoted, this flagrant abuse.

The zeal of our Lord, which breathed nothing of the pharisaical malignity, tended as much to unite and conciliate, as theirs tended to divide and alienate. Nor was there any thing in the leaven of the Pharisees, which he more uniformly opposed, than that assuming spirit, the surest badge of the sectary, which would confine the favour of the universal parent to those of his own sect, denomination, or country. See ch. viii. 11, 12. L. iv. 23, &c. x. 29, &c.

13. *A house.* Mr. xi. 17.

[2] *Of robbers*, *ληστων*. E. T. *Of thieves.* Diss. XI. P. II. § 6.

25. *Whence had John authority to baptise? το βαπτισμα Ιωαννου ποθεν ην ;* E. T. *The baptism of John, whence was it?* But a man's baptism means, with us, solely his partaking of that ordinance; whereas this question relates, not to John's receiving baptism, but to his right to enjoin and confer baptism. The question, as it stands in the common version, conveys, to the unlearned reader, a sense totally different from the author's. It sounds, as though it had been put, 'Was John baptised by an angel, sent from heaven on purpose, or by an ordinary man?' In all such cases, if one would neither be unintelligible, nor express a false meaning, one must not attempt to trace the words of the original. Diss. XII. P. I. § 14.

31. *The first*, *ὁ πρωτος*. In the old Itc. it was *novissimus.* The Cop. Arm. Sax. and Ara. read in the same manner. In the Cam. and two other Gr. MSS. it is *ὁ εσχατος*. This is one of those readings which it would require more than ordinary external evidence to authorise.

32. *In the way of sanctity*, *εν ὁδω δικαιοσυνης.* E. T. *In the way of righteousness.* This is one proof among many of the various significations given to the word *δικαιοσυνη* in the N. T. There can be no doubt that this is spoken principally in allusion to the austerities of John's manner of living in the desert, in respect of food, raiment, and lodging. The word *sanctity*, in our language, though not quite so common, suits the meaning here better than *righteousness.*

33. *Went abroad*, *απεδημησεν.* E. T. *Went into a far country.* This is an exact translation of what is said of the prodigal, L. xv. 13. *απεδημησεν εις χωραν μακραν*, but not of what is

said here. The word *απεδημησεν* implies barely that it was a foreign country he went to; nothing is added to inform us whether it was *far* or *near*.

35. *Drove away with stones another*, *ον δε ελιθοβοληβαν*. E. T. *Stoned another*. But *λιθοβολειν* does not always denote to kill by stoning, as the Eng. word *stoned* seems to imply. That it does not signify so in this place, is evident from the distinction made in the treatment given, *ον δε απεκτειναν*.

36. *More respectable*, *πλειονας των πρωτων*. E. T. *More than the first*. *πλειονας* means *more* either *in number*, or *in value*. As vouchers for the latter use in the N. T. see Mt. v. 20. vi. 25. xii. 41, 42. Mr. xii. 33. L. xi. 31, 32. Heb. xi. 4. The Heb. *rab* signifies both *many* and *great*. The reasons which have induced me, on reconsidering this passage, to prefer, with Markland, the 2d meaning, are these. 1. If the number of servants first sent had been mentioned, or even alluded to by an epithet as *many*, or *few*, *πλειονας* could not have been rendered otherwise than *in greater number*; but not, where there is neither mention of number, nor allusion to it. 2. A climax is evidently intended by the historian, in representing the husbandmen, as proceeding from evil to worse. Now the climax is much better supported by making *πλειονας* relate to dignity, than by making it refer to number. He first sent some inferior servants; afterwards, the most respectable; last of all, his son.

41. *He will put those wretches to a wretched death*, *κακους κακως απολεβει αυτους*. E. T. *He will miserably destroy those wicked men*. This idiom is entirely Grecian. Lucian says *κακοι κακως απολουνται*, *Icaromenippus*. Several other examples have been produced by Sc. and Wa. I have been lucky enough here to express the meaning, without losing the paronomasia, which is not without its emphasis. *Wretches* and *wretched*, like *κακους* and *κακως*, are equally susceptible of both significations, *wicked* and *miserable*. It is not possible always, in translating to convey both the sense and the trope. And when both cannot be done, no reasonable person will be at a loss which to prefer.

43. *Know therefore*. This is one of the clearest predictions of the rejection of the Jews, and of the call of the Gentiles, which we have in this history.

[a] *To a nation*, *εθνει*. Some render the word *To the Gentiles*. That the Gentiles are meant, cannot be doubted. But the Eng.

(especially where there is no risk of mistake) ought not to be more explicit than the Gr. Had it been our Lord's intention flatly to tell them this, his expression would have been, τοις εθνεσι. The article and the plural number are invariably used in such cases. They are here called a *nation*, because, though collected out of many nations, they will as christians constitute *one nation*, the εθνος αγιον mentioned 1 Pet. ii. 9.

CHAPTER XXII.

12. *Friend*, εταιρε. Diss. XII. P. I. § 11.

14. *For there are many called, but few chosen*, πολλοι γαρ ειδι κλητοι, ολιγοι δε εκλεκτοι. E. T. *For many are called, but few are chosen.* The difference in these two ways of rendering is, to appearance, inconsiderable, but it is real. Let it be observed, that the Gr. words κλητοι and εκλεκτοι are merely adjectives; *called* and *chosen*, in the E. T. can be understood no otherwise than as participles, insomuch that, if we were to turn the Eng. into Gr. we should use neither of those words, but say, Πολλοι γαρ ειδι κεκλημενοι, ολιγοι δε εκλελεγμενοι, which does not perfectly coincide in meaning with the expression of the Evangelist. I acknowledge, it is impossible to mark the difference, with equal precision, in any language, which has only one term for both uses. The distinction with us is similar, and nowise inferior to that which is found between Olivetan's, and more modern Fr. versions. The former says, *Plusieurs sont appellés, mais peu sont elus;* the latter, *Il y a beaucoup d'appellés, mais peu d'elus.*

16. *Herodians.* Probably partizans of Herod Antipas, tetrarch of Galilee; those who were for the continuance of the royal power in the descendants of Herod the Great. This was an object which, it appears, the greater part of the nation, especially the Pharisees, did not favour. They considered that family, not indeed as idolaters, but as great conformists to the idolatrous customs of both Greeks and Romans, whose favour it spared no pains to secure. The notion, adopted by some, that the Herodians were those who believed Herod to be the Messiah, hardly deserves to be men-

tioned, as there is no evidence that such an opinion was maintained by any body.

18. *Malice, πονηριαν.* Ch. xxv. 26. N.

[3] *Dissemblers, ὑποκριται.* E. T. *Hypocrites.* Diss. III. § 24.

19. *A denarius.* Diss. VIII. P. I. § 4.

23. *Who say that there is no future life, οι λεγοντες μη ειναι αναστασιν.* E. T. *Which say that there is no resurrection.* The word *αναστασις*, or rather the phrase, *αναστασις των νεκρων*, is indeed the common term, by which *the resurrection*, properly so called, is denominated in the N. T. Yet this is neither the only, nor the primitive, import of the word *ανάστασις*. It denotes simply, being raised from inactivity to action, or from obscurity to eminence, or a return to such a state, after an interruption. The verb *ανιστημι* has the like latitude of signification; and both words are used in this extent by the writers of the N. T. as well as by the Seventy. Agreeably therefore to the original import, *rising* from a seat is properly termed *αναστασις*, so is *awaking* out of sleep, or *promotion* from an inferior condition. The word occurs in this last sense, L. ii. 34. In this view when applied to the dead, the word denotes, properly, no more than a *renewal of life*, to them, in whatever manner this happen. Nay, that the Pharisees themselves did not universally mean, by this term, the re-union of soul and body, is evident from the account which the Jewish historian gives of their doctrine, as well as from some passages in the Gospels; of both which I had occasion to take notice in Diss. VI. P. II. § 19. To say, therefore, in Eng. in giving the tenets of the Sadducees, that *they deny the resurrection*, is, at least, to give a very defective account of their sentiments on this very topic. It is notorious, not only from Josephus, and other Jewish writers, but from what is said, Acts xxiii. 8. that they denied the existence of angels, and all separate spirits. In this they went much farther than the Pagans, who did indeed deny what Christians call *the resurrection of the body*, but acknowledged a state after death, wherein the souls of the departed exist, and receive the reward, or the punishment, of the actions done upon the earth. But not only is the version here given a juster representation of the Sadducean hypothesis, at the same time that it is entirely conformable to the sense of the word, but it is the only version which makes our Lord's argument appear pertinent, and levelled

against the doctrine he wanted to refute. In the common version, they are said to deny the resurrection, that is, that the soul and the body shall hereafter be re-united; and our Lord brings an argument from the Pentateuch to prove——What? not that they shall be re-united (to this it has not even the most distant relation,) but that the soul survives the body, and subsists after the body is dissolved. This many would have admitted, who denied the resurrection. Yet so evidently did it strike at the root of the scheme of the Sadducees, that they were silenced by it, and, to the conviction of the hearers, confuted. Now this, I will take upon me to say, could not have happened, if the fundamental error of the Sadducees had been, barely, the denial of the resurrection of the body, and not the denial of the immortality of the soul, or rather of its actual subsistence after death, for I speak not here of what some call the natural immortality of the soul. If possible, the words in L. xx. 38. *παντες αυτω ζωσιν*, make it still more evident, that our Lord considered this as all that was incumbent on one who would confute the Sadducees, to prove, namely, that the soul continued to live after the person's natural death. Now, if this was the subversion of Sadduceism, Sadduceism must have consisted in denying that the soul continues to live, separated from the body, or, which is nearly the same, in affirming, that the dissolution of the union is the destruction of the living principle. It may be objected, that in v. 28. there is a clear reference to what is specially called *the resurrection*, which, by the way, is still clearer from the manner wherein it is expressed, Mr. xii. 23. *εν τη ουν αναστασει, οταν αναστωσι*. This mode of expression, so like a tautology, appears, to me, to have been adopted by that Evangelist, on purpose to show that he used the word *αναστασις* here, in a more confined sense than he had done in the preceding part of the story. The Sadducee, as is common with disputants, thinks it sufficient, for supporting his own doctrine, to show some absurdity in that of his antagonist. And he considers it as furnishing him with a better handle for doing this, to introduce upon the scene, the woman, and the seven claimants, all at once, who are no sooner raised than they engage in contests about their property in her. But this is no reason why we should not interpret our Lord's words, and the words of the historian, relating to the opinions of the sect, in all the latitude which the nature of the subject, and the context, evidently

show to belong to them. The only modern version I have seen, wherein *αναστασις* is rendered *future life*, is the Eng An.

24. *Leave no children*, *μη εχων τεκνα*. Vul. *Non habens filium*. It may be doubted whether this version has proceeded from a different reading, as it is quite unsupported either by MSS. or by other translations. But it agrees exactly with the Heb. in the passage of Deut. xxv. 5. referred to. The words are there לו אין בן. The sense is the same in both, as in several instances the Heb. *ben* is used for a child indefinitely, of either sex. In the place quoted, the words are rendered in the Vul. *absque liberis*, and in the E. T. *have no child*.

34. *God is not a God of the dead*, *ουκ εστιν ὁ Θεος, Θεος νεκρων*. Vul. *Non est Deus mortuorum*. The Sy. Sax. and Cop. agree with the Vul. in using no word answering to the first *ὁ Θεος*, which is also omitted in the Cam. Dr. Priestley says [Harmony, sect. lxxii.] "This argument of our Saviour's evidently goes on the supposition of there being no intermediate state." Now, to me it is evident, that the direct scope of the argument is to prove, that there is such a state, or, at least, that the soul survives the body, and is capable of enjoyment after the natural death. The reason which the Doctor has subjoined, is, if possible, more wonderful still. "For, admitting," says he, "this [intermediate state,] God might, with the strictest propriety, be said to be the God of those patriarchs, as they were then living, and happy, though their bodies were in the grave." Is it then a maxim with this learned gentleman, that nothing can be admitted which would show the words to be strictly proper, and the reasoning conclusive? So it appears; for, in perfect consistency with this maxim, he concludes his explanation (if I may so call it) with these remarkable words: "There does not, however, seem to be much force in the argument, except with the Jews, to whom it was addressed, and who admitted similar constructions of Scripture. For, though Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, were perished, the person, who spake to Moses might make himself known to him, as he whom they had worshipped." If so, this critic should have said, not that there was not much force, but that there was no force at all, in the argument. The whole then of this memorable confutation,

amounts, according to him, to no more than an argument *ad hominem*, as logicians term it, that is, a fallacious argument, which really proves nothing, and is adopted solely, because the medium, though false, is admitted by the antagonist, who is therefore not qualified to detect the fallacy. But unluckily, in the present case, if the argument be inconclusive, it has not even that poor advantage of being an argument *ad hominem*. The Doctor should have remembered that our Lord, in this instance, was disputing with Sadducees, who paid no regard to the traditionary interpretations, and mystical constructions, of Scripture, admitted by the Pharisees. Yet even these Sadducees were put to silence by it. The truth is, our Lord's argument stands in no need of such a lame apology, as that it is an argument *ad hominem*. Consider it as it lies, without the aid of artificial comments, and it will be found evidently decisive of the great point in dispute with the Sadducees, whether the soul perished with the body. 'God,' says our Lord, 'when he appeared to Moses in the Bush, which was long after the death of the Patriarchs, said to him, *I am the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob; now God is not a God of the dead*, of those who, being destitute of life, and consequently of sensibility, can neither know nor honour him; he is the God of those only who love and adore him, and are, by consequence, alive.' These Patriarchs, therefore, though dead, in respect of us who enjoy their presence here no longer, are alive, in respect of God, whom they still serve and worship. However true then it may be, as the Doctor remarks, that "though Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were perished, the person who spoke to Moses might make himself known to him, as he whom they had worshipped," this remark does not suit the present case: nor could the words of God, on that supposition, have been the same with those which we find recorded by the sacred penman. For God, as in the passage quoted, made himself known to Moses, not as he whom the Patriarchs had worshipped, but expressly as he whom they then worshipped; for he says not, I *was* the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, to wit, when the Patriarchs lived upon the earth, but, I *am* their God at present. It is manifestly from this particularity in the expression, which cannot, without straining, be adapted, either to the past or to the future, that Jesus concludes they were then living. Nor let it be thought too slight a circumstance

for an argument of this importance to rest upon. The argument is, in effect, founded, as all reasoning from revelation, in the veracity of God; but the import of what God says, as related in Scripture, we must, not in this instance only, but in every instance, infer from the ordinary construction and idioms of language. When the Creator, in treating with his creatures, condescends to employ their speech; as his end is to inform, and not to deceive, his words must be interpreted by the common rules of speaking, in the same way wherein we should interpret what is said by any of our fellow-creatures. Now, if we should overhear one man say to another, 'I wish to have you in my service, and to be your master, as I am your father's and your grandfather's, master;' should we not conclude that the persons spoken of are alive, and his servants at this very moment? And would it not be reasonable to insist that, if they were dead, his expression would be, 'As I was your father's, and your grandfather's master?' This is, in effect, the explanation given of the reasoning in this passage, by the most ancient Gr. expositors, Chr. Euth. and The. I know it is urged, on the other side, that though the verb εἰμι is used in the Gr. of the Evangelist, and in the Sep. there is nothing which answers to it in the Heb. and consequently, the words of Moses might as well have been rendered *I was*, as *I am*. But this consequence is not just. The Heb. has no present of the indicative. This want, in active verbs, is supplied by the participle; in the substantive verb, by the juxtaposition of the terms to which that verb in other languages serve as the copula. The absence of the verb, therefore, is as much evidence in Heb. that what is affirmed or denied, is meant of the present time, as the form of the tense is in Gr. or La. Wherever either the past or the future is intended by the speaker, as the Orientals are not deficient in these tenses, the verb is not left to be supplied by the hearer. Thus God says to Joshua (ch. i. 5,) *As I was with Moses*, that is, when he was employed in conducting the sons of Israel in the wilderness, *so will I be with thee.* The verb is expressed in both clauses. See also v.17. and 1 Ki. viii. 57. All which examples are, except in the single circumstance of time, perfectly similar to this of the Evangelist; and are sufficient evidence that, where the substantive verb is not expressed, but the personal pronoun is immediately conjoined with what is affirmed, the sense must, in other languages, be exhibited by the

present. Now, to make the force of the argument, as certain expositors have done, result from something implied in the name *God*, is to convert it into a mere sophism. To affirm that the term itself includes the perpetual preservation of the worshippers, is to take for granted the whole matter in dispute. To have argued thus with a Sadducee, would have been ridiculous. In Scripture, as every where else, the God of any persons or people, means simply that which is acknowledged by them, and worshipped as such. Thus, Dagon is called the god of the Philistines (Jud. xvi. 23.), and Baalzebub the god of Ekron (2 Ki. i. 3.) But the sacred writers surely never meant to suggest that these gods were the authors of such blessings to their worshippers. Nay, it is not even clear that the latter ever expected such blessings from them. What seems to have occasioned the many unnatural turns that have been given to this argument, by later commentators, is solely the misunderstanding of the word *αναστασις*, through not attending to the latitude of signification wherein it was often used in the days of the Apostles. Nor is this the only term in which the modern use does not exactly tally with the ancient.

34. *Flocked about him*, *συνηχθησαν επι το αυτο*. E. T. *Were gathered together*. In this interpretation, the clause *επι το αυτο*, is a mere pleonasm, as *συνηχθησαν* alone implies the whole. Now let it be observed, that thus much might have been affirmed, in whatever place the Pharisees had met; whereas it is the manifest design of the Evangelist to acquaint us, that the preceding confutation of the Sadducees occasioned a concourse of Pharisees to him, which gave rise to the following conversation. I approve, therefore, the way in which Cas. has understood the words *επι το αυτο*, who says, *coiverunt eodem;* and not that which has been adopted by the Vul. and Er. who say, *convenerunt in unum;* or by the Zu. translator, who says, *convenerunt simul;* which has been followed by our translators, and which, in effect, destroys the connexion of the passages. The Cam. reads *επ' αυτον;* but, as in this it is singular, we can lay no stress on it. We can only say, that it is of the less consequence, as it makes no difference on the sense. Be. who adopts that reading, says, *aggregati sunt apud eun.*

35. *A lawyer, νομικος.* Diss. VII. P. II. § 2, 3. and Diss. XII. P. V. § 12.

42. *Whose son should he be ? τινος υιος εστι ;* E. T. *Whose son is he ?* The indicative mood, in the Gr. of the N. T. has often all the extent which is given to that mood in Heb. where it supplies most of the other moods. The import of it in this place is justly rendered in Fr. both by L. Cl. and by Beau. *De qui doit il etre fils ?* which answers exactly to the way I have translated it.

43. *Call him his Lord.* Diss. VII. P. I. § 8.

CHAPTER XXIII.

2. *Sit in Moses' chair.* The Jewish Doctors always taught sitting.

5. *Phylacteries, φυλακτηρια.* A Gr. word exactly corresponding in etymology to the word *conservatories.* They were scrips of parchment used for preserving some sentences of the law written on them, which, from the literal interpretation of Deut. vi. 8. they thought themselves obliged, on several occasions, especially at their prayers, to wear bound upon their forehead, and on their left arm.

8. *Assume not the title of rabbi, for ye have only one teacher, μη κληθητε ῥαββι, εις γαρ εστιν υμων ὁ καθηγητης.* E. T. *Be not ye called rabbi, for one is your master.* Vul. *Vos nolite vocari rabbi, unus est enim magister vester.* The Vul. seems to have read *διδασκαλος*, where it is in the common Gr. *καθηγητης ;* for *διδασκαλος*, is commonly rendered in that version *magister ;* and *διδασκαλος*, is given by John (i. 39.) as an interpretation into Gr. of the Sy. *rabbi.* At the same time, it must be owned, this conclusion, in regard to the reading found in the copies used by the Lat. translator, does not possess a high degree of probability, inasmuch as the word *καθηγητης* is twice rendered by him *magister* in v. 10. The same may be said of the Sax. and, perhaps, some other versions. But it is equally evident, that the Sy. interpreter has read differently. For the word *καθηγητης*, in v. 10. (where there is no such difference of reading,) is by him, as it ought to be, rendered by a word signifying *leader*, or guide ; whereas the term *rabbi* is repeated in v. 8. agreeably to his uniform practice in rendering the Gr. *διδασκα-*

λος. Beside this evidence of a different reading, there is a great number of Gr. MSS. which read διδασκαλος, v. 8. This reading is approved by Orig. and Chr. and many modern critics; amongst whom are Gro. Drusius, Be. Selden, De Dieu, Mill, and Ben. The internal evidence is entirely in favour of this reading. The sense requires that the term, in the latter clause, be equivalent to *rabbi* in the former. That διδασκαλος is such a term, we learn, not only from the Evangelist John, in the place above quoted, but from the use of the Sy. interpreter, who always renders the one term by the other; whereas καθηγητης has, in that version, a distinct interpretation in v. 10. Further, in v. 10. in the common Gr. we find the disciples prohibited from assuming the title of καθηγητης, for the very reason repeated which we find given in v. 8. for their not assuming the title of rabbi. Thus it stands in the two verses: "Assume not the title of rabbi, for ye have only one cathegetes; assume not the title of cathegetes, for ye have only one cathegetes." For my part, I have seen no instance of such a tautology, or so little congruity of expression, in any of the instructions given by our Lord. I therefore approve, in v. 8. the reading of the Sy. interpreter, which is also the reading of many MSS. replacing διδασκαλος, which is perfectly equivalent to *rabbi*. I also think, with that interpreter, that our Lord meant, in the 10th verse, to say something further than he had already said in the 8th. I acknowledge that the sentiments are nearly related; but if there had not been some difference, there would have been no occasion for recurring to a different, and even unusual, term. Our Lord, in my opinion, the more effectually to enforce this warning against an unlimited veneration for the judgments and decisions of men, as a most important lesson, puts it in a variety of lights, and prohibits them from regarding any man with an implicit and blind partiality, as teacher, father, or guide. Now this end is not answered, if all or any two of them be rendered as synonymous. The very uncommonness of the word καθηγητης (for it occurs in no other place of the N. T.) shows an effort to say something more than was comprehended in the preceding words. And let it be observed, that whatever serves to prove that its meaning is not coincident with διδασκαλος, serves also to prove that it is not the authentic reading in v. 8th.

[3] *The Messiah*, ὁ Χριστος. This is wanting in the Sy. Vul. Cop. Sax. and Eth. versions, and in a few MSS.; but the authorities,

both in weight and number, are greatly in its favour. It makes, however, no difference in the sense : because, if not read, the context manifestly supplies it.

9. *And all ye are brethren.* In the common Gr. the words answering to these, to wit, *παντες δε ὑμεις αδελφοι εστε*, are placed in the end of the preceding verse, with which they have little connexion. I have followed a considerable number of copies, in transposing them to the end of verse 9th, immediately after, *he alone is your Father who is in heaven*, with which they are intimately connected. The arrangement is manifestly more natural, gives a closer connexion to the sentiments, and throws more light on the passage than the common arrangement, which places this clause at the end of v. 8. and thereby adds an abruptness to the whole. The intrinsic evidence is therefore entirely in favour of the change.

12. *Whoever will exalt himself shall be humbled ; and whoever will humble himself, shall be exalted*, *ὁστις ὑψωσει ἑαυτον ταπεινωθησεται· και ὁστις ταπεινωσει ἑαυτον, ὑψωθησεται.* E. T. *Whosoever shall exalt himself, shall be abased ; and he that shall humble himself, shall be exalted.* What has induced our translators to render the verb *ταπεινοειν* differently in these two clauses, in one, *to abase*, in the other, *to humble*, it would not be easy to say. *To humble* is, in respect of meaning, equally well adapted to both. When that is the case, a change, by weakening the antithesis, hurts the energy of the expression. In the parallel passages, L. xiv. 11. xviii. 14. they make the same variation. I do not find this mode of rendering, adopted by any ancient, or any foreign, interpreter. It seems peculiar to Eng. translators, some of whom before, and some since, the publication of the common version have taken this method.

13, 14, 15, 16. 23. 25. 27. 29. *Woe unto you, ουαι ὑμιν.* L. vi. 24, 25, 26. N.

14. *Use long prayers for a disguise, προφασει μακρα προσευχομενοι*, E. T. *For a pretence make long prayer.* This is rather too elliptical, and consequently obscure. Otherwise it does not differ in import from that here given. For what is a *pretence*, but a false appearance employed for concealing the truth ? The true motive of their attention and assiduities was avarice : devotion was on-

ly their mask. This verse is wanting in some MSS. in others it is transposed, being placed before the 13th.

[2] *Punishment*, κριμα. E. T. *Damnation.* Mr. xii. 40 N.

16. 18. *Bindeth not*, ουδεν εστιν. E. T. *It is nothing ;* that is 'Though it is, in appearance, it is not, in reality, an oath ; it has not the power of binding.'

19. *Foolish and blind*, μωροι και τυφλοι. The words μωροι και are wanting in the Cam. and two other MSS. The like defect is found in the Vul. and Sax. versions.

23. *Dill*, το ανηθον. E. T. *Anise.* In the same way it is rendered in all the Eng. versions I have seen. Yet ανηθον does not mean *anise*, but *dill.* Our translators have been first misled by a mere resemblance in sound, and afterwards implicitly copied by all their successors. This mistake, though of small consequence, is the more remarkable, as no other but Eng. translators seem to have fallen into it. All the La. interpreters say rightly *anethum*, the Itn. *aneto*, the Fr. *aneth*, Lu. in his Ger. version says **till**, and the Sax. version is dile. It is the more observable, as in most of those languages, the word for *anise* has the like resemblance in sound to ανεθον, with the Eng. word, though with them it has occasioned no mistake. Thus, *anise* is, in Gr. ανισον, in La. *anisum*, in Itn. *aniso*, and in Fr. *anis.*

[2] *Justice, humanity, and fidelity*, την κριδιν, και τον ελεον, και την πιδτιν. E. T. *Judgment, mercy, and faith.* The word *judgment* in our language, when it has any relation to the distribution of justice, never means the virtue or duty of judging justly, but either the right of judging, the act of judging, or the result of judging, that is, the doom or sentence given, right or wrong : sometimes, when spoken in reference to the celestial Judge, it means the effect of that sentence, the punishment inflicted. To this the Gr. κριμα more properly corresponds ; though it must be owned, that the word κριδις, which, by analogy, should be rather *judicatio* than *judicium*, is also often used to denote it. But it is evident, that the word κριδις likewise signifies *distributive justice*, and even sometimes *justice* in the largest acceptation. It is in this place rendered by Cas. *jus*, and by the five Fr. translators, P. R. Si. Sa. L. Cl. and Beau. *la justice.* For the meaning of του ελεου, see ch. ix. 13. [2] N. *Fidelity*, or

faithfulness, is agreed, on all sides, to be the meaning of *την πιστιν* here, where it is ranked among the social virtues.

24. *Who strain your liquor, to avoid swallowing a gnat,* *οι διυλιζοντες τον κωνωπα.* E. T. *Who strain at a gnat.* I do not understand the import of this expression. Some have thought, that it has sprung originally from a mere typographical error of some printer, who has made it *strain at*, instead of *strain out*. Accordingly, most of the late Eng. translators have said *strain out*. Yet this expression, *strain out a gnat*, it must be confessed, sounds very oddly; and it may be justly questioned, whether any good Eng. authority can be produced for such a manner of construing the verb. For this reason, I thought it safer here, though with the aid of circumlocution, to give what is evidently the sense.

25. *Which within are laden,* *εσωθεν δε γεμουσιν.* Vul. *Intus autem pleni estis.* This has, doubtless, sprung from a different reading, but is quite unsupported.

[a] *Iniquity,* *ακρασιας.* Vul. *Immunditia.* E. T. *Excess.* But there is such a general consent of MSS. and Fathers, with the Sy. Ara. and Eth. versions, for the word *αδικιας*, that it is hardly possible to doubt of its being the genuine reading. Besides, it suits much better with all the accounts we have, in other places, of the character of the Pharisees, who are never, as far as I remember, accused of intemperance, though often of injustice. The former vice is rarely found with those who, like the Pharisees, make great pretensions to religion.

32. *Fill ye up then,* *και υμεις πληρωσατε.* A very few copies, and those not of the highest value, read *επληρωσατε*, *Ye have filled up ;* or interrogatively, *Do ye fill up ?* But as they are unsupported alike by ancient versions and ecclesiastical writers, this reading cannot be admitted. I see no difficulty in considering the words as an ironical order, which is always understood to be a severe reproach like that in the Æneid, lib. v. *I sequere Italiam ventis.* Irony is a trope which several times occurs in Scripture ; and we have, at least, one other instance, Mr. vii. 9. of its having been used by our Saviour. Ch. xxvi. 45. N.

34. *Banish from city to city,* *διωξετε απο πολεως εις πολιν.* E.T. *Persecute them from city to city.* That *διωκω* has both significa-

tions, cannot be doubted. But the words, in construction, commonly remove all ambiguity. *Διωκειν απο πολεως* is unquestionably to banish from, or drive out of a city. If it had been, as in ch. x. 23. where the expression is, *όταν διωκωδιν ύμας εν τη πολει*, not *απο της πολεως*, it ought to have been rendered *persecute*. See note on that verse. This distinction seems not to have been attended to by modern translators.

35. *Son of Barachiah.* In the book of Chronicles, to which this passage plainly alludes, Zechariah is called son of *Jehoiada*. But no Gr. MS. extant, or ancient version of this Gospel, has *Jehoiada*. Jerom, indeed, acquaints us, that he found it so in the Heb. Gospel of the Nazarenes. But, considering the freedoms which have been taken with that Gospel, in other places, we cannot account it sufficient authority for changing a term which is supported by the amplest evidence. It is more reasonable to think, with Father Si. that though not mentioned in the O. T. *Jehoiada* must have also had the name *Barachiah*. To have two names was not then uncommon.

[a] *The sanctuary, του ναου.* L. i. 9. N.

36. *All shall be charged upon this generation.* As I understand it, this expression must not be interpreted as implying that those individual crimes, which happened before the time of the people then living, would be laid to their charge ; but that, with every species of cruelty, oppression, and murder, which had been exemplified in former ages, they of that age would be found chargeable ; inasmuch as they had permitted no kind of wickedness to be peculiar to those who had preceded them ; but had carefully imitated, and even exceeded, all the most atrocious deeds of their ancestors from the beginning of the world. There is no hyperbole in the representation. The account given of them by Josephus, who was no Christian, but one of themselves, shows, in the strongest light, how justly they are here characterized by our Lord.

CHAPTER XXIV.

2. *All this ye see, ου βλεπετε παντα ταυτα.* E. T. *See ye not all these things ?* The *ου* is wanting in many MSS. The Vul. Eth.

Cop. Ara. and Sax. versions have no negative particle in this place. As the expression must be read interrogatively, if we admit the negative; and affirmatively, if we reject it; the difference cannot be said to affect the sense. The composition is rather simpler without it. I have, therefore, with many modern critics, omitted it.

3. *The conclusion of this state.* Ch. xii. 32. N.

5. *Many will assume my character,* πολλοι ελευσονται επι τω ονοματι μου. E. T. *Many shall come in my name.* But to come in one's name signifies, with us, more properly, to come by one's authority or order, real or pretended. Thus, *Blessed be he who cometh in the name of the Lord.* In this sense, as the Messiah came in the name of God, the Apostles came in the name of the Messiah. This is far from being the sense of the phrase in the passage under review. Here it plainly signifies, that many would usurp his title, make pretensions to his office and character, and thereby lead their followers into the most fatal delusion. That this is the sense here, is plain from what is immediately subjoined, λεγοντες, *Εγω ειμι ὁ χριστος.* The expression is rendered, not badly, into Itn. by Dio. *Molti veranno sotto il mio nome;* which has been followed in Fr. by the translators of P. R. Si. Sa. and Beau. who say, *Plusieurs viendront sous mon nom;* but L. Cl. says more explicitly, *Il viendra bien des gens qui prendront mon nom.*

10. *Will be ensnared,* σκανδαλισθησονται. Ch. v. 29. N.

15. *On holy ground,* εν τοπω ἁγια. E. T. *In the holy place.* But this expression, with us, invariably denotes *the sanctuary*, or the outer part of the ναος, or temple, strictly so called. This is not the meaning here; neither is τοπος ἁγιος the name by which *the sanctuary* is ever distinguished in the N. T. It is called simply, το ἁγιον, or ἡ σκηνη πρωτη, or ἁγια; the inner part of the house, or most holy place, being distinguished hy the appellation ἡ σκηνη δευτερα, or ἁγια ἁγιαν. Τοπος ἁγιος, therefore, denotes any place, which, comparatively, may be denominated *holy.* The whole temple, το ἱερον, including all the courts, is twice so termed in the Acts. Nay, the whole city Jerusalem, with its suburbs and environs, was *holy*, compared with other cities; and such, also, was the whole land of Judea, compared with other countries. Besides, it deserves to be remarked, that the expression here is indefinite, as it wants the article, and is, therefore, more justly, as it is more literally, render-

ed by Sc. *a holy place*, than in the common version. The place, or ground, here called *holy* is, undoubtedly, the environs of Jerusalem. Accordingly, in the parallel passage in L. we are told : *When ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, know, that the desolation thereof is nigh.*

[2] *The desolating abomination, το βδελυγμα της ερημωσεως.* E.T. *The abomination of desolation ;* that is, when expressed in the common idiom, *the abomination which desolateth*, or maketh desolate. By *abomination*, nothing is more commonly understood, in the language of Scripture, than idols of every kind. It is here, generally, and I think, justly, supposed to refer to the Roman standards to be erected round the city, when it would be besieged by Titus Vespasian. The expressions used here, and in the parallel passages, especially when compared with the history of the siege, as related by Josephus, who, though a Jew, is the best commentator on this prophecy, add the highest probability to the interpretation now given. Those standards had images on them which were adored by the Romans. Nothing could be more properly styled a desolating abomination, as they accompanied the armies which came for the utter destruction of the place ; and as the appearance of those detested ensigns was rendered, to all who received this prophecy, a sure signal of the impending ruin.

[3] *(Reader, attend !) (ὁ αναγινωσκων νοειτω !)* E. T. *(Whoso readeth, let him understand.)* The verb *νοειν*, signifies not only *to understand*, but *to consider, to mind, to attend.* See 2 Tim. ii. 7. In regard to the words themselves, after the strictest examination, I cannot help concluding, that they are not the words of our Lord, and consequently make no part of this memorable discourse, but the words of the Evangelist, calling the attention of his readers to a very important warning and precept of his Master, which he was then writing, and of which many of them would live to see the utility, when the completion of these predictions should begin to take place. I have, therefore, given them in the character by which I always distinguish the words of the writer. My reasons for ascribing them rather to him than to the speaker, are as follows : First, The words are too abrupt, and too much out of the syntactic order for a common parenthesis ; for if this had been a clause immediately connected with the preceding (as those must imagine who think

that *the reader*, here means the reader of Daniel's prophecy,) the τοτε, which follows, should have preceded; and the whole would have run thus: *Οταν ιδητε το βδελυγμα το ρηθεν δια Δανιελ,—εστως εν τοπω αγιω· τοτε ὁ αναγινωσκων νοειτω, ὁι εν τη Ιουδαια φευγετωσαν,—ὁ επι του δωματος μη καταβαινετω,—και ὁ εν τω αγρω μη επιστρεψατω*—With so small an alteration, the sentence would have been grammatical and perspicuous. As it stands, nothing can be more detached than the clause under review. At the first glance, one is apt to think that there should be a full stop at νοειτω. And indeed, if the latter part were entirely away, the former would make a complete sentence. It is not necessary that the second member of a sentence beginning with ὁταν, should be introduced with τοτε; though this adverb is sometimes used for rendering the expression more energetic. The clause, therefore, ὁ αναγινωσκων νοειτω, is here thrust in between the two constituent parts of the sentence, and properly belongs to neither. That it does not belong to the first member, is evident from the mood, as well as the want of the copulative; and it is excluded from the second, by the following τοτε, which, wherever it is used, ushers in all the subjunctive part of the sentence. But though it cannot be made to coalesce with our Lord's words, it appears, when understood as a call to attention from the Evangelist, extremely pertinent. Let it be observed, that our Lord pronounced this prophecy about forty years before the fulfilment of what related to Jerusalem. As this Evangelist is supposed to have written at least eight or ten years after our Lord's crucifixion, this would be about thirty years before the accomplishment. Jesus said, when he spoke this discourse, that there were of his hearers who would live to see the things happen which he had predicted; now as the time was still nearer, when the Evangelist wrote, it was natural for him to conclude, that a great proportion of his readers would be witnesses of the fatal catastrophe, and, therefore, that it was of the last importance to them to fix their attention on a warning, wherein the time is so critically marked, and on the proper use of which, not only their temporal safety, but their conviction of the truth of the Gospel, and consequently, their spiritual interest, might much depend. In this view, this apostrophe is, though short, a complete sentence, and inserted in the only proper place, between the infallible signs of immediate danger, and the conduct then to be pur-

sued. This makes the τοτε, which ushers in the sequel of the sentence, particularly emphatical, as serving to recal the former part. Nor is this at all unconformable to the best use in writing. Such short interruptions, as, *Now mark what follows!* or, *Would God this were duly weighed!* when suitable, serve to awaken attention, and do not suspend the sense long enough to create obscurity. Perhaps it will be said, If there be nothing unsuitable in the figure, ought we not rather to think it has been used by our Lord, than by the Evangelist? The answer is obvious. Our Lord did not write, but speak. Those who received instruction immediately from him, were not readers, but hearers. Had the expression been ὁ ἀκουων νοειτω, it must have been part of the discourse; as it is, it ought to be regarded as a call from the writer, and consequently, no part of the discourse. There is another objection. The Evangelist Mr. uses the expression exactly in the same situation. This, if it was spoken by our Lord, is no more to be wondered at, than their coincidence in any other part of the narrative: but, if it was a sentiment of the writer, that it should have struck both precisely in the same part of the narration, may appear extraordinary. That this should have happened to two writers, neither of whom knew of the writings of the other, is no doubt improbable. But that is not the case here. Mt. who was an Apostle, and an eye and ear-witness of most of the things which he relates, doubtless wrote first. That Mr. who had not the same advantages, but drew his knowledge in a great measure from the Apostles of our Lord, particularly Peter, had read with attention Mt.'s Gospel, there is no reason to doubt. And though he does not copy or follow him implicitly (for there is a considerable difference of circumstances in several parts of the narrative,) the coincidence, in many things, is so great, as could not otherwise be accounted for. And if this acquaintance with our apostle's history be admitted, it will account sufficiently for adopting a figure so apposite to the occasion.

17. *To carry things*, αραι τι. E. T. *To take any thing.* This is a just version of the common reading. But there is a very general consent of MSS. early editions, ecclesiastical writers, and some ancient versions, which read τα instead of τι. This reading I have after Mill and Wet. preferred.

20. *Nor on the sabbath*, μηδε εν σαββατω. E. T. *Neither on the sabbath-day.* There is no word in the original to which the term *day* corresponds. Now, as some expositors maintain, that it is the sabbatical year, and not the weekly sabbath, which is here meant; the translator ought to preserve, if possible, all the latitude of expression employed by the author.

22. *If the time were protracted*, ει μη εκολοβωθησαν αι ημεραι εκειναι. E. T. *Except those days should be shortened. To shorten* any thing, means always to make it shorter than it was; or, at least, to make it shorter than was intended. Neither of these meanings is applicable here. The like exception may be made to the Gr. verb in this place, which is used in the idiom of the synagogue. See a similar use of μεγαλυνω and πλατυνω, ch. xxiii. 5.

24. *Will perform great wonders and prodigies*, δωσουσι σημεια μεγαλα και τερατα. Wa. *will propose great signs and wonders.* No other interpreter that I know, ancient or modern, has so rendered the word δωσουσι. They all represent the signs or wonders, as given or shown (not proposed or promised,) to the people. This author, indeed, uses as little ceremony as Beza, in assigning his reason for this singularity, no other version, it seems, could be made to suit his doctrine of miracles. It may be so: but as the only topics which ought to weigh with a critic, are the import of the words and the scope of the passage; the question is, what meaning do these indicate? As to the first, the words διδοναι σημεια και τερατα, which literally represent the Heb. first occur in the Sep. in Deut. vi. 22. Εδωκε Κυριος σημεια και τερατα, μεγαγα και πονηρα, εν Αιγυπτω. *The Lord showed signs and wonders, great and sore, upon Egypt.* Again, in a public address to God, by the Levites, on a solemn fast; Nehem. ix. 10. Εδωκας σημεια και τερατα εν Αιγυπτω. *Thou showedst signs and wonders in Egypt.* Did the sacred penmen mean to tell us, that God only proposed, but did not exhibit, signs and wonders; that he threatened Egypt with plagues, but did not inflict them? I cannot suppose that even Mr. Wa. will affirm this. That δουναι σημειον invariably denotes to exhibit, not to promise, a miracle, might be proved by examples both from the O. T. and from the N. The only passage which this author quotes as favouring his hypothesis, is Deu. xiii. 1. &c. *If there arise among you a prophet or a dreamer, who giveth thee a sign or a*

wonder, and the sign or the wonder come to pass, &c. Is any one at a loss to discover that the sign here meant is the prediction of some event that exceeds human sagacity to foresee? Such a prediction is a miracle, which though, in fact, performed, when it is uttered, cannot be known to others as miraculous till the accomplishment. The names *prophet* and *dreamer*, serve to confirm this explanation. As to the scope of the passage in the gospel, every body sees that it is to warn the disciples against the artifices of false teachers. Now if all the art of these teachers consisted in promising great things which they never performed, it could not surely have been spoken of as enough to seduce, if possible, even the elect. To promise much and do nothing, far from fitting those impostors to be successful antagonists to men endowed with supernatural powers, did not qualify them as rivals to an ordinary juggler, who, if he have not the reality, has at least the appearance of a wonder-worker. Mere proposers or promisers are fitted for deceiving only the weakest and the most credulous of the people.

30. *Then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven,* τοτε φαινησεται το σημειον του υιου του ανθρωπου εν τω ουρανω. Gr. σημειον, like the La. *signum*, means not only *sign* in general, but *standard, banner*, which is indeed one species of sign. As the the Eng. word *ensign* is equivocal in the same way, the passage may be rendered, *Then shall the ensign of the Son of Man be displayed in heaven.* Such military ideas are not unsuitable to the prophetic style, or even to the tenor of this prophecy, which is highly figurative. But as there appears in the words a plain reference to the question put by the disciples, v. 3. *What will be the sign (το σημειον) of thy coming?* I judged it better to follow the E. T. and retain the reference. We have no reason to think that a particular phenomenon, in the sky, is here suggested. The striking evidences which would be given of the divine presence, and avenging justice, are a sufficient justification of the terms.

36. *But, of that day and that hour,* Περι δε της ημερας εκεινης και της ωρας. Bishop Newton, in his excellent work on the prophecies (Diss. XXI.) says, "It seemeth somewhat improper to say, "*Of that day and hour knoweth no man;* for if the *day* was not known, certainly the *hour* was not: and it was superfluous to make

the addition;" he therefore prefers the word *season* to *hour*. In my opinion the sentence has less the appearance of redundancy, when ὥρα is rendered *hour*. One who says he knows the day when such a thing will be done, is understood to mean the day of the year, suppose the 7th of April; now, if that be known, the season is known. But a man may know the *day*, who knows not the *hour* or time of the day, when a particular event shall take place.

[2] Three MSS. after *ουρανων* read *ουδε ὁ υιος*. The Eth. version has read so. Some MS. copies of the Vul. have *neque filius*, and some of the Fathers seem to have read so. But it is the general opinion of critics (and, I think, is probable) that this clause has been borrowed from the parallel place in Mr. where there is no diversity of reading.

38. *Marrying*, *γαμουντες και εκγαμιζοντες*. The Eng. word comprehends the sense of both the Gr. words, and therefore needs no addition.

40. *Two men.*
41. *Two women.* } Diss. XII. P. IV. § 7, 8, 9.

Immediately after v. 41. we find, in two or three MSS. only, *εδονται δυω επι κλινης μιας*, as in L. xvii. 34. from which it has doubtless been taken.

48. *Vicious*, *κακος*. E. T. *evil.* ch. xxv. 26. N.

49. *Shall beat*, *αρξηται τυπτειν*. Mr. v. 17. N.

51. *Having discarded him*, *διχοτομησει αυτον*. E. T. *Shall cut him asunder.* But this ill suits with what follows of his punishment, which supposes him still alive. It is no answer to say, that the punishment of the wicked will affect both the present life and the future. Let it be remembered, that this is a parable wherein our Lord represents to us, under the conduct of earthly rulers and masters, towards their subjects and servants, in regard to the present state only, what will be the conduct of our Lord and Master in heaven, in regard to both, but principally the future. Now, to mingle thus, and confound, the letter and the spirit of the parable, or the story and the application, and to ascribe to the earthly master, the actions peculiar to the heavenly, would be as contrary to all propriety, as it is repugnant to our Lord's manner. In regard to the word

διχοτομεω, we have little or no light from scriptural use. In the N. T. it occurs only here, and in the parallel passage in L. and in the Sep. it occurs only once. But it has been observed, that the Sy. uses the same word to express the sense of *διχοτομεω* here, and in L. which it employs in other places for rendering *διχαζω* and *μεριζω*, *to divide, to make a breach, to separate.* Now the language spoken by our Lord was a sister-dialect of the Sy. Bishop Pearce has observed that *αποτεμνω* is used by the son of Sirach, Ecclus. xxv. 26. and *εκκοπτω* and *αποκοπτω* by the Apostle Paul, Rom. xi. 22. Gal. v. 12. in the same signification for *discarding*, cutting off from one's family or society. Nor needs there stronger evidence, especially when the absurdity implied in the other interpretation is considered, to satisfy us that this is no more than a Syriasm, to denote, he will deprive him of his office, and so cut him off from his family. Be. has therefore justly rendered it *separabit eum*, in which he has been followed by Pisc. as well as by all the Fr. translators I am acquainted with, whether they translate professedly from the Gr. or from the Vul. They all say, *le separera ;* for the Vul. which says *dividet eum*, will bear this version. All the Eng. translators of this century, except An. who says, *shall turn him out of his family*, have followed the common version.

[2] *With the perfidious*, *μετα των υποκριτων*. E. T. *With the hypocrites.* But this word with us is confined to that species of dissimulation which concerns religion only. It is not so with the Gr. term, which is commonly, and not improperly, rendered by Cas. *simulator, dissembler.* Nay, from the use of *υποκριτης*, and its conjugates, in the Sep. and in the Apocrypha, it appears to have still greater latitude of signification, and to denote sometimes what we should call an unprincipled person, one unworthy of trust. I acknowledge, that in the N. T. it commonly, not always, refers to religious dissimulation. But in a parable, whose literal sense regards secular affairs, the term ought not to be so much limited.

CHAPTER XXV.

1. *To meet the bridegroom*, *εις απαντησιν του νυμφιου*. Vul. *Obviam sponso et sponsæ ; to meet the bridegroom and the bride.*

The Sy. Arm. and Sax. versions have the like addition ; *και της νυμφης* is found in three MSS. of which the Cam. is one. This is no support. The internal evidence, arising from the customs, is clearly against the addition. The virgins conducted the bride, as her companions, from her father's house. The bridegroom went out, from his own house, to meet them, and to bring her home with joy and festivity.

9. *Lest there be not enough for us and you ; go rather to them who sell, and buy for yourselves, μηποτε ουκ αρκεβη ήμιν και ύμιν. πορευεσθε δε μαλλον προς τους πωλουντας, και αγοραβατε έαυταις.* E. T. *Not so, lest there be not enough for us and you ; but go ye rather to them that sell, and buy for yourselves.* Vul. *Ne forte non sufficiat nobis et vobis, ite potius ad vendentes, et emite vobis.* Several interpreters have thought that there is an ellipsis in the original. Our translators, who were of this number, have supplied it by the words *not so.* Elsner and others suppose, that it ought to be supplied by the word *όρατε*, or *βλεπετε*, before *μηποτε*, and therefore render the expression, *take care, lest there be not enough.* But it concerned themselves surely (not those who asked the favour) to take care, before granting it, that there should be a sufficiency for both. Such an answer as this would not be a refusal, as was plainly the case here, but a conditional grant of the request, the askers themselves being made the judges of the condition. The quotation from Acts v. 39. is nowise applicable. The supply of *όρατε* before *μηποτε και θεομαχοι ευρεθητε*, nobody can doubt to be pertinent, because it was entirely the concern of those to whom Gamaliel addressed himself, to take care that they did nothing which might imply fighting against God. It is evident, therefore, that, to make the words before us suit the sense, it would be necessary to supply *δει ήμας σκοπειν*, we must take care. But an ellipsis, such as this, is unexampled in these writers. I have judged it, therefore, more reasonable to follow the authors of the Vul. who have not discovered any ellipsis in this passage. The only thing which can be considered as an objection is the *δε* in the second clause. Suffice it for answer, that this particle is wanting in the Al. Cam. and other MSS. of principal note, as well as in the Vul. and is rejected by some critics of eminence, ancient and modern. And even, were it allowed to stand, it would not be impossible to show that in some instances it is redundant.

13. To this verse there is, in the common editions, a clause annexed, which I have not translated, *εν ῃ ὁ υιος του ανθρωπου ερχεται*. E. T. *Wherein the Son of Man cometh.* But it is wanting in so many MSS. and in the Vul. Sy. and most of the ancient versions, as well as the early ecclesiastical writers who commented on the Gospel, that it cannot, in a consistency with the rules of criticism, be received. There is an evident defect in the next verse,

14. Which is the beginning of a new paragraph. Something (it is not said what) is compared to a man who went abroad. This defect is supplied in the common version, by these words, *The kingdom of heaven is.* In my opinion, it has been originally, *The Son of Man is*, and, from the mistake of supposing this to refer to the words preceding (for in the ancient manner of writing, they had neither points nor distances between the words,) has arisen the interpolation of some words in the 13th verse, and the want of some in the 14th. This, I acknowledge, is but conjecture, though, I think, a very probable one. At any rate, as a supply of some words must be made to v. 14th, those I have used are, at least, as well adapted to the words in connexion as any other that have been employed for the purpose.

26. *Malignant and slothful servant, πονηρε δουλε και οκνηρε.* E. T. *Thou wicked and slothful servant.* There are several words in Gr. and indeed in all languages, which may be justly said to be nearly synonymous, but not entirely so. Of this kind especially are those epithets which relate to character, as *κακος*, *πονηρος*, *ανομος*, *αδικος*, and some others. That they are sometimes used promiscuously, there can be no doubt. And when a translator renders any of them by a general term, as *evil, bad, wicked,* he cannot be said to mistranslate them. Nay sometimes, when used without reference to a particular quality in character or conduct, they ought to be so translated. There is, nevertheless, a real difference among them : and one of them is fitted for marking, more especially, one species, or one degree, of depravity, and another for marking another. *Αδικος*, for example, in its strictest signification, is *unjust*, *ανομος*, *lawless, criminal.* The first relates more to a man's principles of acting, the second to his actions themselves, considered as open violations of law ; *κακος*, when applied to character, answers nearly to our word *vicious*, and *πονηρος*, to *malicious*, or *malignant ; κακος* is accord-

ingly properly opposed to *εναρετος*, *virtuous*, or *δικαιος*, *righteous*, for the former term does not occur in Scripture ; *πονηρος* to *αγαθος*, *good*. *Κακια* is *vice*, *πονηρια malice* or *malignity*. The use of these words in the Gospel, will be found pretty conformable to the account now given. Thus, in ch. xxiv. 48. the servant, who not only neglected his master's business, but ill-treated his fellow-servants, and rioted with debauchees, is very properly denominated, *κακος δουλος*, *a vicious servant*. The bad servant, in this parable, appears in a different light. We learn nothing of his revellings or debaucheries ; but, first, of his *sloth*, which entitles him to the epithet *οκνηρε*, and, secondly, of the *malignity* of his disposition, shown in the unprovoked abuse which, under pretence of vindicating his own conduct, he threw upon his master. The cruel and inexorable is also called *πονηρος*, ch. xx. 32. Let it be remarked also, that a *malignant*, that is, *an envious eye*, is *πονηρος*, not *κακος οφθαλμος*, that the disposition of the Pharisees to our Lord, is ch. xxii. 18. called *πονηρια*, and that the devil is commonly termed *ὁ πονηρος* not *ὁ κακος*. *Malice* is the the most distinguishing feature in his character : but *vice*, which seems more connected with human nature, is not so properly applied to an unembodied spirit. It may be said, Is not then *the evil one* too vague a translation of *ὁ πονηρος* ? I acknowledge it is : but have adopted it merely because it is hazardous, in a term become so common, to depart from established custom. The Gr. *ὁ διαβολος* does not correspond exactly to the Heb. *Satan ;* yet, as the Seventy had employed it, the penmen of the N. T. did not judge it necessary to change it. It is true, however, in general, that there is much more justness in the epithets employed in the Gospel, than is commonly attended to. Too many, in translating, seem to have no other aim, in regard to these, than when the epithet is expressive of a bad quality, to select one to answer to it, as opprobrious as the language they write, can afford them. I am far from saying, that this was the way of those to whom we owe the common version. Though sometimes the import of an original term might have been more exactly hit, they rarely fail to express themselves so as to preserve propriety with regard to the speaker. Now, it deserves to be remarked, that though our Lord, in his rebukes of the hardened offender (for it is only of such I am speaking,) often expresses himself with sharpness, it is always with justice and dignity.

In some translations, on the contrary, he is made to express himself so as we should rather call passionately. In the passage under review, one makes him begin his reply with, *Thou base and indolent slave;* another with, *Thou vile slothful wretch.* But do we ever hear such expressions, except from one in a violent passion? And can any body seriously imagine that it adds weight to the sentence of a judge, to suppose that he spoke it in a rage? Our Lord spoke the language of reproof; such interpreters make him speak the language of abuse. Allow me to add that, in his language, there is more of pointed severity than in theirs. The reason is, his words touch the particular evils; theirs signify only evil in general, in a high degree, and are much more expressive of the resentment and contempt of the speaker, than even of the demerit of the person addressed. The terms, *base*, *vile*, *slave*, *wretch*, used thus, are manifestly of this sort. Like *rascal*, *villain*, *scoundrel*, they are what we properly call scurrility. To abound in appellatives of this sort, is not to be severe, but abusive. Such translators invert that fundamental rule in translating, to make their pen the organ of their author for conveying his sentiments to their readers; they, on the contrary, make their author, and the most dignified characters recorded by him, their instruments for conveying to the world, not only their opinions, but even the asperities of their passions.

27. *With interest*, σὺν τόκῳ. E. T. *With usury.* Anciently the import of the word *usury*, was no other than profit, whether great or small, allowed to the lender for the use of borrowed money. As this practice often gave rise to great extortion, the very name at length became odious. The consideration, that the Jews were prohibited, by their law, from taking any profit from one another for money lent (though they were allowed to take it from strangers,) contributed to increase the odium. When Christian commonwealths judged it necessary to regulate this matter by law, they gave to such profit, as does not exceed the legal, the softer name of *interest;* since which time *usury* has come to signify solely extravagant profit disallowed by law; and which, therefore, it is criminal in the borrower to give, and in the lender to take. As it is not this kind of profit that is here meant, the word *usury* is now become improper.

29. *From him that hath not.* Mr. iv. 24, 25. N.

[2] *That which he hath, ὁ εχει.* In a considerable number of MSS. but few of any note, it is *ὁ δοκει εχειν.* Agreeable to which is the Vul. *quod videtur habere*, also the second Sy. and the Sax. This expression has probably been borrowed by some copyist as more correct from L. viii. 18. where its genuineness cannot be questioned.

34. *From the formation of the world, απο καταβολης κοσμου.* E. T. *From the foundation of the world.* Vul. *A constitutione mundi.* Ar. *A fundamento mundi.* Er. *Ab exordio mundi.* Lu. *A primordio mundi.* Cas. *Ab orbe conditio.* Be. *A jacto mundi fundamento.* It is very uncommon to find every one of these translators adopting a different phrase, and yet, perhaps, more uncommon to find that, with so great a variety in the expression, there is no difference in the sense. If any of the abovementioned versions be more exceptionable than the rest, it is that which renders *καταβολη foundation :* for, first, this term, except in the sublimer sorts of poetry, is not very happily applied to the world, in which there is nothing that can be said to correspond to the foundation of a house. Secondly, the word is never used in Scripture to express that part of a house, or edifice of any kind, which we call *the foundation :* for though there is frequent mention of this part of a building, the word is never *καταβολη*, but always *θεμελιος*, or some synonymous term ; and this observation holds equally of the N. T. the Sep. and the Jewish Apocryphal writings. I admitted that, in the highly figurative style of the Heb. poets, such an image as that of laying the foundation might be applied to the world. I find it in the O. T. twice applied to the earth, which is nearly the same ; but it deserves our notice, that in neither of the places is the word in the Sep. *καταβολη*, or any of its derivatives. One of the passages is Ps. cii. 25. (in the Sep. ci. 26.) *Of old thou hast laid the foundation of the earth, Κατ' αρχας, την γην εθεμελιωσας ;* the other quite similar, Is. xlviii. 13. where the same verb is used. Thirdly, in the only place where *καταβολη* occurs in Hellenistic use, as applied to a house (which is in the Apocrypha, 2 Mac. ii. 29.), it is so far from meaning the foundation, that it denotes the whole structure as contradistinguished to the several parts. See the passage in Gr. and in the common translation, where *καταβολη* is rightly rendered *building*.

36. *Ye assisted me*, επεσκεψασθε με. E. T. *Ye visited me.* The Eng. word *visited* does not sufficiently express the import of the Gr. verb, when the subject of discourse is a sick person, or one in distress. In such cases, επισκεπτομαι is strictly *visito ut opem feram.* That more is meant here than a visit of friendship, for giving consolation, is probable from the expression used in the next clause, ηλθετε προς με, which is intended to denote such friendly visits, being often all that a Christian brother can do for prisoners. Some late translators render επεσκεψασθε με, *ye took care of me.* This, I think, is in the opposite extreme, as it is hardly applicable to any, but the physician or the nurse.

CHAPTER XXVI.

3. The clause και οι γραμματεις is wanting in a few noted MSS. The authors of the Vul. and of some other versions, have not read it in their copies. But as it is found in the Sy. and the much greater number both of MSS. and of ancient versions, and is not unsuitable to the scope of the place, I have retained it.

* *Palace*, αυλην. Though αυλη strictly signifies an open court before the entry of a house or palace (see note on v. 58.), it is not uncommon to employ it by synecdoché for the palace.

5. *Not during the festival*, μη εν τη εορτη. E. T. *Not on the feast day.* As there is nothing in the original answering to the word *day*, the term εορτη may include the whole *festival;* to wit, the day of the paschal sacrifice, and the seven days of unleavened bread that followed it. As, therefore, it is not certain that one day only is spoken of, it is better to leave it in the same latitude in which we found it. *Festival* may either denote the first day, which was properly the day of celebrating the passover, or it may include all the eight days.

7. *Balsam*, μυρου. E. T. *Ointment.* But it is evident, from what is said here, and in other places, both in the O. T. and in the New, that their μυρα were not of the consistency of what we denominate *ointment*, but were in a state of fluidity like oil, though somewhat thicker.

12. *It is to embalm me, προς το ενταφιασαι με.* E. T. *For my burial.* The *προς το*, in several instances, expresses rather the intention of Providence, than the intention of the person spoken of. This circumstance is mentioned by our Lord here, with a view to suggest the nearness of his funeral. For the import of the word *ενταφιασαι*, see the note on J. xix. 40.

15. *Thirty shekels, τριακοντα αργυρια.* Diss. VIII. P. I. § 10.

16. *To deliver him up, ινα αυτον παραδω.* E. T. *To betray him.* We say a man has sold what he has concluded a bargain about, though he has not delivered it to the purchaser. In like manner, Judas *betrayed* his master to the pontiffs, when the terms were settled between them, though he did not then put them in possession of his person.

22. *Began every one of them to say, ηρξαντο λεγειν αυτω εκαστος αυτων.* Mr. v. 17. N.

26. *The loaf, τον αρτον.* E. T. *Bread.* Had it been *αρτον*, without the article, it might have been rendered either *bread*, or *a loaf*. But as it has the article, we must, if we would fully express the sense, say *the loaf*. Probably, on such occasions, *one loaf*, larger or smaller, according to the company, was part of the accustomed preparation. This practice, at least in the apostolic age, seems to have been adopted in the church, in commemorating Christ's death. To this, it is very probable, the Apostle alludes, 1 Cor. x. 17. *Ὁτι εἱς αρτος, ἑν σωμα οἱ πολλοι ἐσμεν· οἱ γαρ παντες ἐκ του ἑνος αρτου μετεχομεν.* That is, *Because there is one loaf, we, though many, are one body ; for we all partake of the one loaf.* It is in the common translation, *For we, being many, are one bread and one body ; for we are all partakers of that one bread.* Passing at present some other exceptions which might be made to this version, there is no propriety in saying *one bread*, more than in saying *one water*, or *one wine*. Ch. iv. 3. N.

[2] *Having given thanks, ευλογησας.* But the number of MSS. many of them of principal note, editions, fathers, &c. that read *ευχαριστησας*, is so great, as to remove every doubt of its being genuine. Mill and Wet. both receive it. Indeed it may be said to be of little consequence here which way we read, as the two words are ad-

mitted by critics to be, in this application, synonymous. Ch. xiv. 19. N.

28. *Of the new covenant, της καινης διαθηκης.* Diss. V. P. III.

29. *Of the product of the vine, εκ τουτου του γενηματος της αμπελου.* E. T. *Of this fruit of the vine.* But the Gr. term for fruit is *καρπος.* The word *γενημα* I have literally rendered. Besides, *The fruit of the vine* is not *wine*, but *grapes ;* and we speak of *eating*, but never of *drinking, fruit.* In the phrase corresponding to this in the Heb. rituals, a term is employed that commonly signifies *fruit.* But our original is the language of the Evangelist, not that of the Rabbies. *The product* is here equivalent to *this product ;* because it cannot be this individual, but this in kind, that is meant.

Until the day, when I shall drink it with you, in my Father's kingdom. I confess, I do not see the difficulty which some fancy they see in these words. That the expression is figuarative, will not, I believe, be denied : yet not more so than the terms *fire* and *brimstone*, as applied to the future doom of the wicked. If we have not positive evidence that there will be any thing in heaven analogous to eating and drinking, as little have we, that there will not. And there is at least no absurdity in the supposition. As far as our acquaintance with living creatures extends, means are always necessary for the support of life. That no means are requisite in heaven, (if it be a truth) is not self evident. It will hardly be pretended that it is expressly revealed ; and as yet we have no experience on the subject. We know, there will be nothing analogous to marriage. Where the inhabitants are immortal, there is no need of fresh supplies. But it does not appear implausible, that the use of means for the preservation of life may constitute one distinction between the immortal existence of angels, and men, and that of him who, by way of eminence, is said (1 Tim. vi. 16.) *alone to have immortality.* Difficulties in scripture arise often from a contradiction, neither to reason, nor to experience ; but to the presumptions we have rashly taken up, in matters whereof we have no knowledge.

30. *After the hymn, υμνησαντες.* E. T. *When they had sung an hymn.* But *υμνεω* may be either *I sing*, or *I recite a hymn.* In the latter way it has been understood by the author of the Vul. and by Ar. who render it, *Et hymno dicto.* Cas. to the same purpose,

Deinde dictis laudibus. But Er. Zu. Be. Pisc. and Cal. *Quum hymnum cecinissent.* All the modern translations I have seen, except Lu.'s, and such as are made from the Vul. follow these last ; the Sy. is equally ambiguous with the original, and so are most of the Oriental versions, and the M. G. As it is evident, however, that the words are susceptible of either interpretation, I have followed neither, but used an expression of equal latitude with the original. I have chosen to say *the hymn*, rather than *a hymn ;* as it is a known fact, that particular Psalms, namely, the cxiv. and four following, were regularly used after the paschal supper.

31. *I shall prove a stumbling-stone to you all,* παντες, ὑμεις σκανδαλισθησεσθε εν εμοι. E. T. *All ye shall be offended because of me.* The word *snare* answers equally well with *stumbling-stone* for conveying the sentiment ; (Ch. v. 29. N.) yet as there may be here an allusion to the passage in the Psalms (so often quoted in the N. T.) representing our Lord as a select and chief corner-stone which to many would prove a stone of stumbling, πετρα σκανδαλου, I have been induced to prefer a closer interpretation in this place.

38. *My soul is overwhelmed with a deadly anguish,* περιλυπος εστιν ἡ ψυχη μου ἑως θανατου. E. T. *My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death.* But this expression, *unto death,* is rather indefinite, and seems to imply a sorrow that would continue till death ; whereas, the import of the original is, such a sorrow as is sufficient to cause death, that is, *deadly.* Cas. has expressed the sense thus, *In tanto sum animi dolore ut emoriar.* The last clause sufficiently explains ἑως θανατου.

39. *Not as I would, but as thou wilt,* ουχ ὡς εγω θελω, αλλ' ὡς συ. E. T. *Not as I will, but as thou wilt.* As the Heb. has no subjunctive or potential mood, the indicative, in conformity to the Oriental idiom, is frequently used by the penmen of the N. T. in the sense of the subjunctive. Our Lord's *will,* in effect, perfectly coincided with his Father's ; because it was his supreme desire, that his Father should be obeyed, rather than that any inclination of his own should be gratified. The first clause, therefore, ought to express, not what was in reality, as matters stood, but what would have been, his desire, on the supposition that his Father's will did not interfere. This

is properly expressed by L. Cl. *Non comme je le voudrois, mais comme tu le veux*, which is the way I have adopted.

45. *Sleep on now, and take your rest*, καθευδετε το λοιπον, μαι αναπανεσθε. Some late interpreters translate this with an interrogation, thus, *Do ye still sleep on, and take your rest?* This appears, at first, to suit better the words which follow, *Arise, let us be going*. I cannot, however, help favouring the more common, which is also the more ancient, translation. The phrase το λοιπον, and simply, λοιπον, when it relates to time, seems always to denote the future. There are only three other places in Scripture, where it has clearly a relation to time, and in regard to these there can be no doubt. The first is Acts xxvii. 20. Λοιπον περιηρειτο παθα ελπις του θωξεθθαι ημας E. T. *All hope that we should be saved was then taken away.* The version would have been still better if closer, and instead of *then*, it had been said *thenceforth*. It is rendered by Cas. *Cætera spes omnis salutis nostræ sublata erat.* 2 Tim. iv. 8. where it is rendered by our translators *henceforth*, and Heb. x. 13. where it is rendered *from henceforth*. There is reason, therefore, here to retain the common version; nor is there any inconsistency between this order, which contains an ironical reproof, very natural in those circumstances, and the exhortation which follows, *Arise*. Ch. xxiii. 32. N.

[2] *Of sinners*, αμαρτωλων. The Gr. word expresses more here than is implied in the Eng. term. Our Lord thereby signified, that he was to be consigned to *the heathen*, whom the Jews called, by way of eminence, αμαρτωλοι, because *idolaters*. See Gal. ii. 15. For a similar reason they were also called *ανομοι*, *lawless*, *impious*, as destitute of the law of God. The expression δια χειρων ανομων (Acts ii. 23.), ought therefore to be rendered, not as in the E. T. *by wicked hands*, but *by the hands of the wicked*, or rather *impious*.

47. *Clubs*, ξυλων. L. xxii. 52. [2] N.

50. *Friend*, εταιρε. Diss. XII. P. I. § 11.

52. *Whoever hath recourse to the sword*—a proverbial expression not to be rigidly interpreted. Such sayings are understood to suggest what frequently, not what always, happens. It seems to have been introduced at this time, in order to signify to the disciples that

such weapons as swords were not those by which the Messiah's cause was to be defended.

55. *A robber*, *ληστην*. E. T. *A thief*. Diss. XI. P. II. § 6.

58. *The court of the high priest's house*, *της αυλης του αρχιερεως*. E. T. *The high priest's palace*. From v. 69. as well as from what we are told in the other Gospels, it is evident that Peter was only in the court without, which, though enclosed on all sides, was open above, nor was it any-wise extraordinary to kindle a fire in such a place. L. xxii. 55. N.

[2] *Officers*, *υπηρεταις*. E. T. *Servants*. Υπηρεται, means, commonly, servants of the public, or official servants of those in authority, the officers of a judicatory.

59. *And the elders*, *και οι πρεσβυτεροι*. This clause is wanting in the Vul. Cop. and Arm. versions, and in two or three MSS. It is not wanting in the Sax. which makes it probable that the Itc. read as we do.

60. *But though many false witnesses appeared, they found it not*, *και ουχ' ευρον*, *και πολλων ψευδομαρτυρων προσελθοντων ουχ' ευρον*. The repetition of *ουχ' ευρον*, in the common copies, is very unlike the manner of this writer. In the Vul. Sy. Cop. Ara. and Sax. the phrase is found only once. It is not repeated in the Com. nor in some ancient MSS. As it makes no addition to the sense, and does not perfectly agree with the strain of the narrative, I have followed the example of some of the best ancient translators, in avoiding the repetition.

63. *I adjure thee*, *εξορκιζω σε*. This appears to have been the Jewish manner of administering an oath. The Heb. השבית *hishbiang*, which in the O. T. is commonly, by our interpreters, rendered, *to make one swear*, is justly translated by the Seventy, *ὁρκιζω*, or *εξορκιζω*. The name of the deity sworn by was subjoined, sometimes with, sometimes without, a preposition. Thus, Gen. xxiv. 3. where we have an account of the oath administered by Abraham to his steward, which is rendered in the Eng. Bible, *I will make thee swear by the Lord, the God of heaven, and the God of the earth*, is thus expressed in the Sep. *εξορκιω σε Κυριον τον Θεον του ουρανου και της γης : I adjure thee by Jehovah, the God of heaven and earth*. After such adjuration, by a magistrate or lawful superior, the answer returned by the person adjured, was an answer upon

oath : a false answer was perjury ; and even the silence of the person adjured was not deemed innocent. Many examples of this use of the simple verb *ὁρκιζω*, which is of the same import with the compound, may be discovered by consulting Trommius' Concordance. Mr. v. 7. N.

64. *At the right hand of the Almighty*, *εκ δεξιων της δυναμεως*. E. T. *On the right hand of power.* The Heb. word הגבורה *hageburah*, *power*, or *might*, in the abstract, that is, *omnipotence*, or supreme power, was become, with Jewish writers, a common appellation for God. As the abstract, here, does not suit the idiom of our tongue, and as, in meaning, it is equivalent to our word, *the Almighty*, I have used this term in the translation. The Vul. says *Virtutis Dei.*

65. *Blasphemy.* Diss. X. P. II.

68. *Divine to us*, *προφητευσον ἡμιν*. E. T. *Prophesy unto us.* But the Eng. verb, to prophesy, always denotes to foretell what is future : here a declaration is required concerning what was past. The verb, *to divine*, is applicable to either, as it denotes, simply, to declare any truth not discoverable by the natural powers of man. From the Evangelists Mr. and L. we learn that our Lord was at this time blindfolded.

71. *Said to them, This man too was there*, *λεγει τοις εκει· Και ουτος ην*. E. T. *Said unto them that were there, This fellow was also.* But a very great number of MSS. amongst which are some of the most ancient, read *λεγει αυτοις· Εκει και ουτος ην*. The Sy. and Go. have read so. It is in the Com. and Ald. editions. It is supported by Origen and Chr. and preferred by Gro. Mill and Wetstein. I might add that, in the common reading, the adv. *εκει.* is absurdly superfluous ; for, who can imagine that she addressed herself to those who were not there ?

CHAPTER XXVII.

2. *The procurator.* Diss. VIII. P. III. § 17.

5. *Strangled himself*, *απηγξατο*. E. T. *Hanged himself.* The Gr. word plainly denotes *strangling ;* but does not say how, by hanging, or otherwise. It is quite a different term that is used in

those place where *hanging* is mentioned. It nay be rendered, *was strangled*, or *was suffocated*. I have, in the above version, followed the Sy. The common translation follows the Vul. which says, *laqueo se suspendit*. Wa. *was choked with grief*. This interpreter does not deny that *strangled* expresses the common meaning of the Gr. word in classical authors. The examples he produces in support of his version, serve only to show that, in a few obscure instances, the word *may* (not *must*) have the signification which he assigns to it. There are only two examples wherein it occurs in the Sep. One is 2 Sam. xvii. 23. where it is applied to Ahithopel, in which he does not seem to question the justness of the common version : the other is Tob. iii. 10. where it is spoken of Sara the daughter of Raguel. This passage, that interpreter thinks, clearly confirms (and I think, it clearly confutes) his version. That the daughter's suicide would bring dishonour on the father may be understood by any body ; but her dying of grief, in consequence of the bad treatment she received from strangers, might be to a parent a subject of affliction, but could not be a matter of reproach.

6. *The sacred treasury*, *τον κορβαναν*. E.T. *The treasury*. The word, in the original, occurs in no other passage in Scripture. Josephus makes use of it, and interprets it, *τον ἱερον θησαυρον*. It is formed from *κορβαν*, originally Heb. which also occurs but once in the Gr. form, Mr. vii. 11. and signifies that which is given or *devoted to God*. The unlawfulness of putting the thirty shekels into this repository, arose from this single circumstance, that it contained the treasure consecrated to God.

8. *That field is called the field of blood*, *εκληθη ὁ αγρος εκεινος αγρος αἱματος*. Vul. *Vocatus est ager ille Haceldama, hoc est ager sanguinis*. To the words, *Haceldama, hoc est*, as there is nothing that corresponds in any MS. or translation, except the Sax. and as they are quite superfluous, there can be no doubt that they are an interpolation from Acts i. 19. With insertions of this kind, the Latins have been thought, even by some of their own critics, more chargeable than the Greeks.

9. *Jeremiah*. The words here quoted are not in any prophecy of Jeremiah extant. But they bear a strong resemblance to the words of Zechariah, xi. 12, 13. One MS. not of great account,

has *Ζεχαριου*. Another adds no name to *προφητου*. There is none added in the first Sy. version. And it would seem, from a remark of Augustine, that some copies, in his time, named no Prophet. But as all the other MSS. now extant, even those of the greatest antiquity, the Vul. and the other ancient versions, the Sy. alone excepted, all the earliest ecclesiastical writers, read just as we do, in the common editions, I did not think a deviation from these could be denominated other than an emendation merely conjectural.

9, 10. "*The thirty shekels, the price at which he was valued, I took, as the Lord appointed me, from the sons of Israel, who gave them for the potter's field.*" *Ελαβον τα τριακοντα αργυρια την τιμην του τετιμημενου, ὁν ετιμησαντο, απο υιων Ισραηλ· και εδωκαν αυτα εις τον αγρον του κεραμεως, καθα συνεταξε μοι ὁ Κυριος.* E.T *They took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was valued; whom they of the children of Israel did value, and gave them for the potter's field, as the Lord appointed me.* *Ελαβον* may be either the first person singular, or the third person plural. The latter hypothesis has been adopted by the Vul. and the majority of translators, ancient and modern. The former has been preferred by the Sy. and the Per. translators. There can be no doubt, that their way of rendering gives more perspicuity, as well as more grammatical congruity, to the sentence. As the words stand in most versions, they appear to represent the action of one, as the obedience of an appointment given to another. Thus: *They took the silver pieces, and gave them—as the Lord appointed* [not *them*, but] *me*. This incongruity, and the obscurity arising from it, are entirely removed by the other interpretation, which has also this advantage, that it is more conformable to the expression of Zechariah referred to, *ελαβον τους τριακοντα αργυρους*. So it runs in the Sep. Now there is no ambiguity in the Heb. verb, as there is in the Gr. The former cannot be rendered, but by the first person singular. This would certainly have determined all translators to prefer this manner, as being at once more conformable to Syntax, to common sense, and to the import of the passage, to which the allusion is made. But there arose a difficulty from the verb *εδωκαν*, which appears to be coupled, in construction, with *ελαβον*. Now, on the supposition that it was so construed, as *εδωκαν* could be no other

than the third person plural, *ελαβον* must be so too. In one of the copies, called Evangelistaries (which are MSS. of the Gospels, divided according to the manner of reading them in some church or churches,) it is *εδωκα*, in the first person singular. The Sy. interpreter seems also to have read *εδωκα*, in the copy or copies used by him. But this is too slight an authority, in my opinion, for deserting the common reading. I, therefore, entirely approve the ingenious solution that has been given by Knatchbull, and read *εδωκαν* in the third person plural, not as coupled by the conjunction with *ελαβον*, but as belonging to a separate clause; in which case, the version will be literally as follows: *I took the thirty shekels (the price of him that was valued, whom they valued) from the sons of Israel (and they gave them for the potter's field,) as the Lord appointed me.* The version given in the text, is the same in meaning, but more perspicuously expressed. Here, indeed, the words, *and they*, supply the place of the relative *who*, a very common Hebraism. It is surely much less usual, though I will not say unexampled, to make, as our translators do, the phrase *απο υιων Ισραελ*, serve as a nominative to the verb *ετιμησαντο*.

11. *Thou art the King of the Jews? Συ ει ὁ βασιλευς των Ιουδαιων;* E. T. *Art thou the King of the Jews?* Vul. Ar. Er. Cal. *Tu es rex Judæorum?* There can be no doubt that this is an interrogation; but it is equally certain, that the form of the expression is such as admits us to understand it either as an affirmation, or as an interrogation. Now, I imagine, it is this particularity, in the form of the question, which has given rise to the customary affirmative answer, *συ λεγεις*, wherein the answerer, without mistaking the other's meaning, expresses his assent to the words, considered in the simple form, as an assertion; and this assent serves equally as an answer to the question. But this would not be a natural manner of answering, if the form of the question were such as could not admit being interpreted otherwise than as a question. In that case, nothing can, with any propriety, be said to have been advanced by the asker. As sometimes, with us, a question is put derisively, in the form of an assertion, when the proposer conceives, as seems to have happened here, some absurdity in the thing; I thought it best, after the example of so many Lat. interpreters, to adopt the equivocal, or

rather the oblique, form of the original expression. The ambiguity is not real, but apparent. The accent in speaking, and the point of interrogation in writing, do, in such cases, sufficiently mark the difference. Dio. has also adopted this method, and said, *Tu sei il re de' Judei?* All the other modern versions I have seen, follow Be. Pisc. and Cas. who put the question in the direct form, the two former saying, *Tune es*——the other, *Esne tu*——Leo de Juda says, *Es tu*——

17, 18, 19, 20, 21. The reader will observe, that there is, in these verses, in the common version, some appearance both of tautology and of incoherency, which, in my opinion, is entirely removed, by including the 18th and 19th in a parenthesis, and understanding the 21st as a resumption, after this interruption, of what had been mentioned in the 17th verse. Let the whole passage in the original be carefully examined, and compared with the common version, and with this.

24. *Of this innocent person*, *του δικαιου τουτου*. E. T. *Of this just person.* Cas. *Hujus innocentis.* L. Cl. *De cet innocent.* The forensic sense (as I may call it) of the Heb. word צדיק *tsadick*, and consequently of the Gr. *δικαιος*, adopted as equivalent, is no more than *innocent*, or *not guilty*, of the crime whereof he stands accused. This appears from many places of the O. T. which relate to judicial proceedings, particularly Deut. xxv. 1. and Prov. xvii. 15. where it is contrasted with a word commonly rendered *wicked*, and which, in its forensic meaning, denotes no more than *guilty* of the crime charged. Pilate does not appear to have known any thing of our Lord's character, and therefore could pronounce nothing positively. But he could not fail to see, that this accusation brought before him, sprang from malice, and was unsupported by evidence.

29. *Of thorns*, *εξ ακανθων*. Bishop Pearce has remarked, in a note on this verse, that *ακανθων* may be the genitive plural, either of *ακανθα*, *thorn*, or of *ακανθος*, the herb called *bear's-foot*, a smooth plant, and without prickles. But in support of the common version let it be observed, first, that in both Mr. and J. it is called *στεφανος ακανθινος*. This adjective, both in sacred use, and in classical, plainly denotes *spineus*, *thorny*; that it ever means made of *bear's*

foot, I have seen no evidence. Thus in the Sep. (Is. xxxiv. 13.) in the common editions, the phrase *ακανθινα ξυλα*, is used for prickly shrubs. 2dly, That the word *ακανθα, thorn*, both in the right case, and in the oblique cases, occurs in several places of the N. T. and of the Sep. is unquestionable. But that, in either, the word *ακανθος* is found (leaving this, and the parallel passage in J. about which the doubt is raised, out of the question,) has not been pretended. 3dly, Not one of the ancient, or of the Oriental, versions, or, indeed, of any versions known to me, favours this hypothesis. The Itc. and Sy. which are the oldest, both render the word *thorns*. The silence of ecclesiastical writers, for near two centuries, if this can be properly pleaded, after what has been observed of the ancient Itc. and Sy. interpreters, and especially, when we consider how few of the works of the earliest Fathers are extant, proves nothing at all. That Tertullian, the first of the Lat. Fathers, mentions the crown as being of thorns, and speaks in such a manner as clearly shows that he had never heard of any different opinion, or even doubt raised upon the subject, is very strong evidence for the common translation. Add to this, that an eminent Gr. Father, Clement of Alexandria, a contemporary of Tertullian, understood the word in the same manner. "It is absurd," says he (Pæd. l. 2. c. 8.), "in us, who hear that our Lord was crowned with thorns, *ακανθαις*, to insult the venerable sufferer, by crowning ourselves with flowers." Several passages equally apposite, might be given from the same chapter, but not one word that betrays a suspicion that the term might be, or a suggestion that it ever had been, otherwise interpreted. There is, therefore, here the highest probability, opposed to mere conjecture.

34. *Vinegar, οξος*. Vul. *vinum*. With this agree the Cop. Arm. Sax. 2d Sy. and Eth. versions. The Cam. and a few other MSS. read *οινον*.

Wormwood, χολης. E. T. *Gall.* The word *χολη* is used with great latitude in the Sep. The Heb. word signifying *wormwood*, is twice so rendered, Prov. v. 4. Lam. iii. 15. At other times it seems to denote any bitter or poisonous infusion, that tasted like gall. To give such a beverage to criminals before their execution, was then used, in order to make them insensible of the horrors of death.

35. [*Thus verifying the words of the prophet, "They shared my mantle among them, and cast lots for my vesture,"*] *ινα πληρωθη το ρηθεν υπο του προφητου· Διεμερισαντο τα ἱματια μου ἑαυτοις, και επι τον ἱματισμον μου, ἐβαλον κληρον.* These words are wanting in a very great number of MSS. in which the most valuable are included, in the works of some ancient commentators, in several early versions and editions. Though the Vul. in the common editions, has this clause, it is not found in many of their best MSS. As it was a practice, with some transcribers, to correct, and, as they imagined, improve, one Gospel by another, it is extremely probable, that this clause has been, at first, copied out of J. to whose Gospel it properly belongs. For this reason I have marked it, as of doubtful authority.

40. The reproach in this verse is introduced in the Vul. by the interjection, *Vah!* in which concur the Cop. Sax. and 2d. Sy. The Cam. and another. MS. read *Ova.*

40. 43. *God's Son.* See note on ch. iv. 3. and on v. 54. of this chapter.

41. *And the Pharisees.* The words *και φαριϭαιων*, though not in the common edition, are found in a very great number of MSS. some of which are of principal note. They are in the Cam. and some of the oldest editions. With these agree the Ara. and both the Sy. versions. Origen and The. have read so. They are approved by Wet. and other moderns.

42. *Cannot he save himself? ἑαυτον ου δυναται ϭωϭαι;* E. T. *Himself he cannot save.* The words may be understood, either as an affirmation, or as a question. I think, with Bishop Pearce, that the latter way is better suited to the context, as well as more emphatical.

45. *The whole land, πασαν την γην.* The word *γη* is equivocal, and may be rendered either *earth* or *land.* Some have thought, that the addition of *παϭα*, ought to determine our preference in favour of the most extensive signification of the word; but this argument is not conclusive. No two expressions can be more similar than *εγειετο λιμος επι πασαν την γην*, L. iv. 25. and Mt.'s expression here, *εγενετο σκοτος επι πασαν την γην.* Without some special reason, therefore, nothing could be more capricious than to

render the former. *There was famine throughout all the land;* and the latter, *There was darkness over all the earth.*

46. *Eli, eli, lama sabachthani.* It is to be observed, that these are not the very words of the Heb. original of the psalm quoted: but they are in what is called Syrochaldaic, at that time the language of the country, the dialect which our Lord seems always to have used. It is not entirely the same with the language of the Sy. version, but very near it. The only difference, in this exclamation, between the Psalm and the Gospel, is that, in the latter, we have *sabachthani* where, in the former, we have *ghazabthani*. The Sy. interpreter has not, as all other interpreters, given first the very words of our Lord on this occasion, and then an interpretation of them in the language he was writing; but, by a very small alteration on some of the words, he has made them suit the dialect of his version, so as to need no other interpretation. In Sy. they run thus *Eil, eil, lamana sabachthani?* Yet, even here, one would suspect a different reading; *Eil* signifies *God*, not *my God*. The reader will perceive that the difference in sound is inconsiderable. See the Preface to this Gospel, § 19. and Mr. xv. 34. N.

47. *Some of the bystanders said, "He calleth Elijah."* These must have been some of the strangers, of whom there was always a great concourse at the passover, who did not understand the dialect then spoken in Jerusalem.

50. *Resigned his spirit, αφηκε το πνευμα.* E. T. *Yielded up the ghost.* This is exactly agreeable to the sense, though the phrase is somewhat antiquated. Dod. *Dismissed his spirit.* He thinks, after Jerom, that there was something miraculous in our Lord's death, and supposes it to have been the immediate effect of his own volition. Whether this was the case or not, the words here used give no support to the hypothesis. The phrase *αφιεναι την ψυχην*, which is very similar, is used by the Seventy, Gen. xxxv. 18. speaking of Rachel's death. The like expressions often occur in Josephus, and other Gr. writers. Nay, an example has been produced from Euripides, of this very phrase, *αφηκε πνευμα* for *expired.* Indeed the primitive meaning of the word *πνευμα* is *breath*, from *πνεω I breathe.* In this sense it occurs Gen. vi. 17. 15. 2 Sam. xxii. 16. Ps. xviii. 15. xxxiii. 6. and many other places.

51. *The veil of the temple.* Probably the inner veil, which divided the *holy* from the *most holy place.*

54. *The son of a god, θεου υιος.* E. T. *The Son of God.* Let it be observed, that the phrase, here, is neither *ὁ υιος του θεου, the son of God*, nor *υιος του θεου, a son of God;* but it is *υιος θεου*, both words being used indefinitely, *a son of a God;* an expression perfectly suitable in the mouth of a polytheist, like the Roman centurion. The reason of my using the definitive article before the word *son*, is, because it is more conformable to our idiom. If the father be expressed indefinitely, though the definite article be prefixed to *son*, it has no emphasis in Eng. Thus, should one say, of a person enquired about, He is *the son of a merchant*, nobody would understand, as implied in this answer, that he is either *the only son*, or *the eldest.* Yet this mode of answering is more common than to say, He is a son of a merchant. But when the father is mentioned by his proper name, or distinguished by his office from every other person, we use the indefinite article before the word *son*, when we mean to express no more than the relation. Thus: *He is a son of the Lord Chancellor*, or *of Mr. Such-a-one.* Likewise, in deducing a genealogy, the definite article is frequently used before *son*, without any meaning. Thus, we may say: *Judah the son of Jacob, the son of Isaac, the son of Abraham.* The usual Fr. idiom is in this, preferable, which is now also adopted in Eng. They use no article, definite or indefinite, in such cases, but say *Juda fils de Jacob, fils d'Isaac, fils d'Abraham.* So much for anomalies, in the use of articles that obtain amongst ourselves. Yet nothing would be more unjust than to conclude, from this, that our articles have no distinctive import, but are used promiscuously, and capriciously. Let us not, then, fall into the like fallacy, in arguing about the articles of other languages, because of a few exceptions which, to us, may appear capricious. I know it may be objected to what is advanced above, concerning the Gr. article, that in this ch. v. 43. the words *θεου υιος* occur without any article, where the term *θεου* must nevertheless be understood definitely. But, when a phrase, expressed fully, comes soon to be repeated; articles, and other definitives, such as pronouns and epithets, are, for brevity's sake, often omitted. In v. 43. there is an implied reference to what was expressed more fully, *υιος του θεου*, v. 40.; the same strain of scoffing is continued through the whole. Instances of such omissions, in the

like cases, are very numerous. I admit, also, in regard to substantives in general, that the article is sometimes omitted, when the meaning is definite, but hardly ever added when it is indefinite. I am not certain, whether υἱος, in the two verses now referred to, should be rendered *a son*, or *the son*. Plausible reasons may be advanced for each. I have avoided the decision, by rendering it in both verses, *God's son*, which may mean either. This, as I signified before, is the method I choose to take, in cases which appear doubtful. But if the words in connexion be ever sufficient to remove all doubt, they are sufficient in v. 54. That the expression in question came from one who, as he believed a plurality of gods, could scarcely have spoken otherwise than indefinitely, is perfectly decisive. Let it be observed, further, that the same indefinite expression is ued in the parallel place, Mr. xv. 39. See ch. iv. 3. N. ch. xiv. 33. N. Mr. i. 1. N.

56. *Mary Magdalene*, Μαρια ἡ Μαγδαληνη. It might be rendered, more literally, and even properly, *Mary the Magdalene*, or *Mary of Magdala*, in the same way as Ἰησους ὁ Ναζαρηνος is *Jesus the Nazarene*, or *Jesus of Nazareth*. There can be no doubt that this addition, employed for distinguishing her from others of the same name, is formed from *Magdala*, the name of a city mentioned ch. xv. 39. probably the place of her birth, or at least of her residence. The appellation, *Magdalene*, stands now, however, so much on the footing of a proper name, that any the smallest change would look like an affectation of accuracy in things of no moment.

61. *The other Mary*, ἡ αλλη Μαρια. Sc. *Another Mary*. But this last version is agreeable, neither to the letter, nor to the sense, of the original. I should not have taken notice of it, were it not to show how grossly the import of the articles is sometimes mistaken, and how strangely they are confounded. This learned writer, in his notes, after mentioning the common version, *the other Mary*, adds, "This might be proper, if there were but two Marys," I answer, it is sufficient to the present purpose, that there were but two Marys, whom the Evangelist had mentioned a very little before, to wit, at v. 56. These were *Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James and Joses*. He now again names Mary Magdalene,

adding, *and the other Mary.* Can any person, who reflects, be at a loss to discover, that he says *the other*, to save the repetition of *the mother of James and Joses?* In order to evince the redundancy, not to say, insignificancy, of the Gr. articles, this author produces two other examples, which, doubtless, have appeared to him the most convincing. The first is, Mt. x. 23. *Ὁταν διωκωσιν ὑμας εν τη πολει ταυτη, φευγετε εις την αλλην*, which I have rendered, *When they persecute you in one city, flee to another;* but which is, in the common version, *When they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another.* Now, to me, this passage, so far from showing the Evangelist's negligence, in his manner of using the articles, proves his accuracy. If he had expressed the first clause indefinitely, *ὁταν διωκωσιν ὑμας εν μια πολει*, and added, *φευγετε εις την αλλην*, this writer's reasoning would have been just; nor could there have been a clearer evidence, that the articles were sometimes used without any determinate meaning. But as the first clause was expressed definitely, propriety required that the second should be definite also. *Εις την αλλην*, therefore, in this place, is equivalent to *εις την εκεινην*, and opposed to *εν τη πολει ταυτη*. Since our translators, therefore, rendered the first clause, *When they persecute you in this city*, they ought to have rendered the second, *flee into that*, or, *into that other:* for this is one of those instances (and there are several, as has been often remarked by grammarians) wherein the article has the force of a pronoun. I have chosen, in this translation, to express the whole indefinitely, as this manner suits better the genius of our tongue, and is equally expressive of the sense. The other way, in a language wherein it flows naturally and easily, does not, I acknowledge want its advantages in point of vivacity. But to begin in one manner, and end in the other, offends alike against propriety and elegance. The other example, taken from J. xviii. 15. I should admit without a moment's hesitation, to be clearly in favour of Dr. Sc.'s doctrine, if I did not consider it as an erroneous reading. See note on that verse.

63. *Within three days, μετα τρεις ἡμερας.* Ch. ii. 16. [3] N.

64. *Command that the sepulchre be guarded.* This, as being a servile work, it might be thought, they would not ask to be done

on the Sabbath. But we ought to reflect, that they asked this of Romans, whom they did not consider as bound by the law of the Sabbath. Jews, to this day, do not scruple to avail themelves of the work done by Christians on the Sabbath. See the note on v. 65.

65. *Ye have a guard.* Some have thought that the guard, here meant, was the Levites, who kept watch in the temple (L. xxii. 52. N.); others, that it was a band of Roman soldiers who, during the great festivals, guarded the porches of the outer court, and had it in charge to quell any tumult which might arise there, or in the city. Of this guard extraordinary, at their public solemnities, mention is made by Josephus (Antiq. l. viii. c. iv.) That it was not the Levites, the ordinary temple watch, who are here alluded to, appears from the following reasons: 1st, The service of that watch does not seem to have extended beyond the walls of the temple. 2dly, If their assistance had been judged necessary, the chief priests had no occasion to recur to Pilate for obtaining it, as, by the constitution, they who served in the temple were under the sole direction of the priests. 3dly, As the day, on which the assault seems to have been dreaded, was the Sabbath, it is probable that they would choose to have Romans soldiers, whom they could lawfully employ, and who would be restrained by no religious scruple, rather than Jews, for suppressing any tumult on that day. 4thly, Had the guard been Levites, they were accountable only to the chief priests; whereas, being Romans, they needed the priests, as mediators with Pilate, before they could be induced, by a sum of money, to propagate a falsehood, which reflected so much on themselves as military men, and even exposed them to punishment. Lastly, the name κουστωδια, here given them, which is neither Gr. nor Sy. but a La. word, shows clearly they were *Romans*. It may be objected, 'But, in that case, would the procurator have said, ye have a guard, thus representing the Roman soldiers as under their authority?' I take this to be no more than a civil way of granting their request. As, in modern language, we should say, 'The guard is at your service.'

CHAPTER XXVIII.

1. *Sabbath being over*, οψε σαββατων. E. T. *In the end of the Sabbath.* This could be spoken only of Saturday evening; for the Sabbath ended at sun-set. That this is not the meaning here is manifest from what follows, which shows it to have been the dawn on Sunday. Οψε before a genitive often means *after*. Besides, in the Jewish idiom, *the evening* is understood to include the whole night, from sunset to sunrise.

2. *There had been a great earthquake*, Σεισμος εγενετο μεγας. Pearce after Markland says, "rather *commotion*, i. e. in the air." Wa. *disturbance*. Though it is acknowledged that σεισμος signifies not only *earthquake*, but sometimes *tempest*, *whirlwind*;—the first is the common acceptation, from which we ought not to depart, unless when the words in connexion require it. This is certainly not the case here. Markland imagines that the word εσεισθησαν, applied to the guards, v. 4. was intended by Mt. to prevent men's mistaking the import of the word σεισμος, v. 2. If this was the Evangelist's intention in using that verb, he has not been lucky in the choice of an expedient, for σεισμος here, till of late, appears to have been understood by all interpreters for *earthquake*.

[2] *From the entrance*, απο της θυρας. These words are wanting in the Cam. and two other MSS. There is nothing corresponding to them in the Vul. and Sax. versions.

9. *When they were gone*, ως δε επορευοντο. E. T. *And as they went.* Dod. and Wy. *As they were going.* If, in Hellenistic use, accuracy were observed in regard to the verbs, the last would be the only proper way of rendering the expression. But from the very different nature of the Oriental tongues, there has arisen, among Jewish writers, an indefinite application of the Gr. tenses and moods, which renders them, in some cases, not a little equivocal. The expression employed, Acts xx. 18. ως δε παρεγενοντο προς αυτον, is extremely similar to that under review; yet no Eng. interpreter has scrupled to render it *When they were come*, (not *coming*) *to him*, as this is a meaning to which the words connected evidently confine it. Now, as the words are susceptible of this interpretation, candour

seems equally to require it, when it is essential to the consistency of the sacred historians.

[2] This whole clause, ὡς δε επορευοντο απαγγειλαι τοις μαθηταις αυτου, is wanting in the Sy. Vul. Cop. Arm. Ara and Sax. versions. It is wanting also in the Cam. and many other MSS. Chr. appears not to have read it. It is rejected by Mill and some other modern critics. Beside these, one or two MSS. which retain ὡς δε επορευοντο, omit απαγγειλαι τοις μαθηταις αυτου, which are also the concluding words of the former sentence. As the latter clause, when retained, makes not the smallest alteration in the sense, I thought the above authorities might be held reason sufficient for passing it.

[3] *Rejoice*, χαιρετε· E. T. *All hail.* The term *hail*, in saluting rarely occurs now, except in Scripture and poetry. However, as, in some cases, we have no word which can properly supply its place, as it is very well understood, and by Scriptural use, as well as antiquity, rendered respectable, it ought not, in a translation of the Gospels, to be entirely laid aside ; at the same time, it must be owned, that when the salutation stands alone, as in this passage, or is not accompanied with some compellation to the persons saluted, its appearance is rather awkward. Our translators have been so sensisible of this, as to judge it necessary to insert the word *all*, to render the expression fuller. But even with this addition it still sounds oddly, and has been rarely copied by later translators, some of whom have preferred the way of circumlocution. *I salute you*, says one. Cold and formal. *God save you*, says another, which seems to imply some impending danger. To me, the literal translation of the Gr. word appears, in point of propriety, as well as simplicity, preferable to any of these methods.

14. *If this come to the procurator's ears*, εαν ακουσθη τουτο επι του ηγεμονος. Wo. and Wa. *If this come to a hearing before the governor :* that is, *to a judicial trial.* That this is the meaning appears to me highly improbable. In such a public inquiry, it is not easy to conceive how the chief priests and elders could interfere, without betraying themselves and risking every thing. But nothing can be more likely than their promising to use their secret influence with the procurator, to induce him, (in case he should hear the report,) to overlook it, and thus prevent examination altogether ;

a promise which, doubtless, they have faithfully kept, as it entirely accorded with what they accounted their interest. Dr. Symonds discovers a vulgarity in the phrase, of which I am not sensible. If sound, according to the modern theory, be produced by an undulation of air striking the auditory nerve, we may say, I think, without a figure, that *a rumour has come to our ears.* That ingenious writer has not scrupled to say, (page 3.) *If we cast our eyes upon the period.* Now this expression is, in my judgment, much more exceptionable than the other. There is a real motion from the sonorous object to the ear ; but the eyes are never cast upon this object. I may as well speak of casting my ears upon a sounding object, to denote—I listen to it.

17. *Threw themselves prostrate, προσεκυνησαν.* Ch. ii. 2. [2] N.

19, 20. *Convert all the nations—teaching them, μαθητευσατε παντα τα εθνη—διδασκοντες αυτους.* E. T. *Teach all nations —teaching them.* Vul. Ar. Er. Zu. Be. Cal. Pisc. *Docete omnes gentes—docentes eos.* Cas. employs the same verb, though in a different form ; instead of *Euntes docete*, saying, after his manner, *Vadite doctum—docentes eos.* The Sy. has preserved the distinction very properly. There are manifestly three things which our Lord here distinctly enjoins his Apostles to execute with regard to the nations, to wit, *μαθητευειν, βαπτιζειν, διδασκειν*, that is, to convert them to the faith, to initiate the converts into the church by baptism, and to instruct the baptised in all the duties of the Christian life. Our translators have, after the whole current of La. interpreters, confounded the first and the last, rendering both words by the same Eng. word *teach.* The foreign translators have not been so implicit followers. Dio. says, *Ammaestrate tutti le genti—insegnando loro.* G. F. *Endoctrinez toutes nations—les enseignans.* L. Cl. *Faites des disciples parmi toutes les nations—apprenez leur.* Beau. with whom Si. agrees, has not expressed, with the same distinctness, the two parts of the charge ; for though the terms he employs are different, they are nearly synonymous, *Enseignez toutes les nations—leur apprenant.* P. R. and Sa. though they translate from the Vul. where the error originated, have distinguished them better, *Instruisez tous les peuples—leur apprenant.* The like variety is to be found in our late Eng. versions, none of which has followed here the common translation. An. Hey. and Wor. say,

Instruct all nations. Dod. *Proselyte all nations.* Wy. *Make disciples in all nations.* Wa. *Make disciples of all the nations.* Sc. and Wes. *Disciple all nations.* They all render the beginning of the 20th. v. *Teaching them.* The first of these, *Instruct all nations,* is certainly too vague and indefinite. If *to instruct* and *to teach* be not here entirely synonymous, their significations are so nearly coincident, that were they, in these two verses, to change places, it would not make a sensible difference on the meaning. Wy. in saying *Make disciples,* has hit exactly the sense of *μαθητευω,* but it is one thing *to make disciples in all nations,* and another thing *to make all nations disciples.* Wa. does better in this respect. Sc. and Wes. intended well, but there is no such verb as *to disciple* in the language. It is found, indeed, in Spencer, who affected obsolete words ; but he uses it in a very different sense ; for with him it is *to punish,* or to treat with severe discipline. The version which Dod. has given of this passage appears the least exceptionable. But the verb *to proselyte,* though sometimes occurring, is so far from being in common use, and has so much the appearance of a learned or technical term, that, in a style so natural and familiar as that of the Evangelists, we ought not, without necessity, to recur to it. But there can be no necessity here, as the verb *to convert,* applied as in this passage, has precisely the same meaning. See the note on ch. xviii. 3.

[2] *The conclusion of this state, της συντελειας του αιωνος.* Ch. xii. 32. N.

[3] The *amen,* with which this Gospel concludes, is wanting in four MSS. and in the Vul. Cop. and Arm. versions.

NOTES

CRITICAL AND EXPLANATORY.

THE GOSPEL BY MARK.

For the title, see the note on the title of the preceding Gospel.

CHAPTER I.

1. *The beginning of the Gospel.* Some consider *αρχη* here as the nominative to the verb *εγενετο*, v. 4. and include the quotations from the Prophets, verses 2d and 3d, in a parenthesis. But abstracting from the awkwardness of so long a suspension of the sense in the very first sentence, the expression *αρχη του ευαγγελιου εγενετο Ιωαννης βαπτιζων*, appears nowise agreeable to the style of the sacred writers; nor will it be found to answer better, if we invert the order, and say with Markland, *Ιωαννης βαπτιζων εγενετο αρχη του ευαγγελιου* whereas, *εγενετο Ιωαννης βαπτιζων*, *John came baptising*, or simply, *John baptised*, is quite in their idiom. See ch. ix. 7. L. ix. 35. The first verse, therefore, ought to be understood as a sentence by itself. It was not unusual with authors to prefix to their performance a short sentence, to serve both as a title to the book, and to signify that the beginning immediately follows. See Hos. i. 1, 2. In this manner also Herodotus introduces his history, *Ἡροδοτου Ἁλικαρνασσηος ἱστοριης αποδειξις ἡδε.* This usage, probably, gave rise to the custom afterwards adopted by transcribers, of putting, at the head of their transcript, *incipit*, followed by the name of the book or subject, and subjoining at the foot, *explicit*, with the name repeated, as a testimony to the reader, that the work was entire. This purpose it was, with them, the better fitted for answering, as the whole book was commonly written on one large and continued scroll, hence called a volume, and not, as with us, on a num-

ber of distinct leaves. So far, however, the custom obtains still, that we always prefix a short title on the page where we begin, and subjoin *The end*, on the page where the work is concluded.

[3] *Son of God, υἱου του Θεου.* As brevity is often studied in titles, the article before *υἱου* is probably, on that account, left out. Let it be noted, in general, that the omission of the article in Gr. is not like the insertion of the indefinite article in Eng. a positive expression that the word is to be understood indefinitely. The phrase *υἱος του Θεου*, as was hinted before (Mt. xxvii. 54. N). exactly corresponds to the Eng. *Son of God*, which leaves the reader at liberty to understand *son* definitely, or indefinitely, as he thinks proper. The term *God's Son* answers the same purpose; but though well adapted to the familiarity of dialogue, it does not always suit the dignity of historical narration. Mt. xiv. 33. N.

2. *In the prophets, εν τοις προφηταις.* Such is the common reading. But it ought not to be dissembled, that six MSS. two of them of considerable note, some ancient versions, amongst which are the Vul. and the Sy. and several ecclesiastical writers read, *in the prophet Isaiah.* As the common reading, however, has an immense majority of copies in its favour, and some noted translations, such as the Ara. and the Eth. as it is more conformable to the scope of the place, where two quotations are brought from different prophets, and the nearest is not from Isaiah, but from Malachi, I could discover no good reason for departing from the received reading.

[2] *Angel.* Diss. VIII. P. III. § 9, &c.

3. *In the wilderness, εν τη ερημω.* It is called, in Mt. iii. 1. *the wilderness of Judea*, which is mentioned Jud. i. 16. and in the title of Ps. lxiii. It lay east from Jerusalem, along the Jordan, and the lake *Asphaltites*, also called *the Dead Sea.* By *wilderness* in Scripture, it is plain that we are not always to understand, what is commonly denominated so with us, a region either uninhabitable or uninhabited. Often no more was denoted by it than a country fitter for pasture than for agriculture, mountainous, woody, and but thinly inhabited. Thus, Jer. xxiii. 10. E. T. *The pleasant places of the wilderness are dried up.* Sep. *Εξηρανθησαν αι νομοι της ερημου.* Houbigant. *Pascua deserti aruerunt.* Literally—*The pastures of the wilderness are parched.* Lightfoot has well observed, that these

ερημοι did not want their towns and villages. What is called (L. i. 39.) την ορεινην, *the hill-country*, where Mary visited her cousin Elizabeth, is included (v. 80.) in ταις ερημοις, *the deserts*, where the baptist continued from his birth, till he made himself known to Israel. In the similitude of the lost sheep, what is in Mt. xviii. 12. *Will he not leave the ninety-nine upon the mountains ?* επι τα ορη is in L. xv. 4. *Doth not leave the ninety-nine in the desert*, εν τη ερημω. The man who had the legion is said (Mr. v. 5.) to reside εν τοις ορεσι, and (L. viii. 29.) to have been driven by the demon εις τας ερημους. I do not say, however, that the words were equivalent. Every untilled country they called ερημος, but every ερημος they did not call ορεινη. The principal difference between the ερημος and the rest of Judea, was that the one was pasturage and the other arable. In the arable, the property of individuals was separated by hedges, or some other fence ; in the pasturage, the ground belonged in common to the inhabitants of the adjoining city, or village, and so needed no fences. The word ερημος in scripture, admits a threefold application. One is, to what is with us called *wilderness*, ground equally unfit for tillage and pasture, such as the deserts of Arabia. When used in this sense, it is generally for distinction's sake, attended with some epithet or description, as *howling*, *terrible*, or *wherein is no water ;* it is sometimes used for *low* pasture-lands ; sometimes for *hilly*. In this application, it oftenest occurs in the gospel, where it appears to be nearly of the same import with our word *highlands*.

4. *Publishing*. Diss. VI. P. V.—³ *Reformation*. Ib. P. III.

10. *The Spirit descend upon him*, το πνευμα καταβαινον επ' αυτον. Vul. *Spiritum descendentem et manentem in ipso*. So also the Sax. Agreeably to this, we find, in four Gr. MSS. of little account, και μενον inserted, which is all the authority now known.

11. *In whom*, εν ω. The Cam. and several other MSS. have εν σοι. Vul. *in te*. So also Sy. Go. Sax. Cop. Arm.

13. *Forty days*, ημερας τεσσαρακοντα. The Vul. adds, *et quadraginta noctibus*. Three Gr. MSS. have και νυκτας τεσσαρακοντα. Conformable to which are also the Ara. Cop. Sax. and Eth. versions.

14. *Good tidings.* Diss. V. P. II.—[2]*Reign.* Ib. P. I.

15. *The time is accomplished, ὁτι πεπληρωται ὁ καιρος.* E. T. *The time is fulfilled.* The time here spoken of is that which, according to the predictions of the prophets, was to intervene between any period assigned by them, and the appearance of the Messiah. This had been revealed to Daniel, as consisting of what, in prophetic language, is donominated seventy weeks, that is (every week being seven years) four hundred and ninety years ; reckoning from the order issued to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem. However much the Jews misunderstood many of the other prophecies relating to the reign of this extraordinary personage ; what concerned both the time and the place of his first appearance, seems to have been pretty well apprehended by the bulk of the nation. From the N. T. as well as from the other accounts of that period still extant, it is evident that the expectation of this great deliverer was then general among them. It is a point of some consequence to the cause of Christianity, that both the time and the place of our Lord's birth coincided with the interpretations then commonly given of the prophecies, by the Jews themselves, his contemporaries.

19. *Mending, καταρτιζοντας.* The Gr. word *καταρτιξειν* not only signifies *to mend* or *refit*, but also *to prepare, to make.* Interpreters have generally preferred here the first signification. This concurrence itself, where the choice is indifferent, is a good ground of preference to later interpreters. But I do not think the choice in this passage indifferent. A fishing bark, such as Josephus describes those on this lake to have been (lib. ii. ca. 43. *De Bello,)* though an improper place for manufacturing nets in, might be commodious enough for repairing small injuries sustained in using.

24. *Art thou come to destroy us ?* Lightfoot (Hor. Heb.) observes, that the Jews had a tradition that the Messiah would destroy Galilee, and disperse the Galileans. He thinks, therefore, that this ought to be considered as spoken by the man, who was a Galilean, and not by the demon, as it is commonly understood.

[2] *The holy One of God.* Diss. VI. P. IV. L. iv. 34. N.

28. *Through all the region of Galilee, εις ὁλην την περιχωρον της Γαλιλαιας.* E. T. *Throughout all the region round about Gal-*

ilee. Vul. *In omnem regionem Galilææ.* This version of the old La. interpreter entirely expresses the sense, and is every way better than that given by Be. *In totam regionem circumjacentem Galilææ,* who has been imitated by other translators, both in La. and in modern languages, often through a silly attempt at expressing the etymology of the Gr. words. Had Galilee been the name of a town, περιχωρος must no doubt have meant the *environs*, or circumjacent country. But as Galilee is the name of a considerable extent of country, the compound περιχωρος denotes no more than the simple χωρος, or, if there be a difference, it only adds a suggestion that the country spoken of is extensive. But as *the region round about Galilee* must be different from *Galilee* itself, or, which is the same thing, *the region of Galilee*, the translators that render it so, totally alter the sense. The use of περιχωρος in the Sep. manifestly supports the interpretation which, after the Vul. and all the ancient interpreters, I have given. Ἡ περιχωρος Αργοβ is, in our bible, *the region of Argob;* ἡ περιχωρος του Ιορδανου, *the plain of Jordan.* Other examples might be given, if it were necessary. To express properly in Gr. *the region round about Galilee*, we should say, ἡ περιχωρος, not της Γαλιλαιας, but περι την Γαλιλαιαν the repetition of the preposition being quite agreeable to the genius of the tongue. Thus, Apoc. xv. 6. Περιεζωσμενοι περι τα στηθη. There is no occasion, therefore, for Dr. Pearce's correction, "rather into the whole region of Galilee, which was round about, *i. e.* about Capernaum;" a comment which is, besides, liable to this other objection, that, if the lake of Gennesaret was, as is commonly supposed, the boundary of Galilee on the east, it would not be true that Capernaum, which was situated on the side of the lake, was surrounded by Galilee.

38. *The neighhouring boroughs,* τας εχομενας κωμοπολεις. The Cam. εγγυς πολεις και εις τας κωμας. Vul. *proximos vicos et civitates.* So also Sy. Go. Sax. and Ara. The reading of a single MS. can have no weight in this case. And the versions have a very little. The uncommonness of the word κωμοπολεις, which occurs not in the Sept. and no where else in the N. T. might naturally lead translators to resolve it into κωμας και πολεις. But, as it is understood to denote something intermediate, greater than the one and less than the other, the sense is sufficiently expressed by the Eng. word *boroughs.*

43. *Strictly charging him, εμβριμησαμενος αυτω.* Mt. ix 30. ³N.

44. *To the priest, τω ιερει.* Vul. *Principi sacerdotum.* Two ordinary Gr. MSS. have *τω αρχιερει.* The Sax. also follows the Vul. This is all the collateral evidence which has been produced for the reading of the Vul. Wet. adds the Go. version. But if I can trust to the Go. and Anglo-Saxon versions, published by Junius and Mareschal, Amsterdam 1684, the Go. is here entirely agreeable to the common Gr. Indeed there is every kind of evidence, external and internal, against this reading of the Vul. The power of judging in all such cases belonged by law equally to every priest. The addition of the article *τω*, in this passage, appears to have arisen from this circumstance, that, during the attendance of every course, each priest of the course had his special business assigned him by lot. One, in particular, would have it in charge to inspect the leprous and unclean, and to give orders with regard to their cleansing. For this reason it is said *the priest*, not *a priest;* but we have reason to think that, except in extraordinary cases, *the high priest* would not be called upon to decide in a matter which the law had put in the power of the meanest of the order. The Sy. uses the plural number, *to the priests.*

CHAPTER II.

2. *The word of God, τον λογον.* L. i. 2. N.

7. *Blasphemies.* Diss. X. P. II. § 14.

8. *Jesus knowing in himself, επιγνους ὁ Ιησους τω πνευματι αυτου.* E. T. *When Jesus perceived in his Spirit.* There is something particular in the expression of the Evangelist. At first, it would appear applicable only to the perception a man has of what passes within his own mind, when the object of his thought is his own faculties and their operations. This species of knowledge we commonly distinguish by the name *consciousness.* But this is far from suiting the application of the phrase here, where the thing perceived was what passed in the minds of others. To me it appears manifest, that the intention of the sacred writer was to signify that our Lord, in this case, did not, as others, derive his knowledge from the ordinary and outward methods of discovery, which are open to all men,

but from peculiar powers he possessed, independently of every thing external. I have, therefore, preferred to every other, the simple expression *knowing in himself;* both because *perceiving in*, or *by, his Spirit*, has some ambiguity in it, and because the phrases ἡ ψυχη αυτου and το πνευμα αυτου often, in the Jewish idiom, denote *himself.* May it not be reasonably concluded, that the information as to the source of this knowledge in Jesus, is here given, by the sacred writer, to teach all Christians, to the end of the world, that they are not to think themselves warranted, by the example of their Lord, to pronounce on what passes within the hearts of others, inasmuch as this is a branch of knowledge which was peculiar to the Son of God, whose special prerogative it was, not to need that any should testify concerning man unto him, as of himself he knew what was in man. J. ii. 25.

15. *Placed themselves at table.* Diss. VIII. P. III. § 3—7.

17. [*To reformation,*] εις μετανοιαν. This clause is wanting here in a greater number of MSS. and ancient versions than in Mt. ix. 13. (See note 3d on that verse.) It is rejected by Gro. Mill, and Ben. It is not improbable that it has originally, by some copyist who has thought the expression defective without it, been borrowed from L. v. 32. about which there is no diversity of reading. But though there may be some ground to doubt of its authenticity in this place, and in that above quoted from Mt. yet, as there can be no doubt of its appositeness, I thought it better to retain it in both places, and distinguish it as of doubtful authority.

18. *Those of the Pharisees,* οι των Φαρισαιων. In a considerable number of MSS. (some very valuable) we read οι Φαρισαιοι. The Vul. has *Pharisæi*, not *discipuli Pharisæorum.* This is also the reading of the Cop. Go. Sax. and second Sy. versions. But they are not all a sufficient counterpoise to the evidence we have for the common reading.

19. *The bridemen,* οι υιοι του νυμφωνος. E. T. *The children of the bride-chamber.* It is evident that the Gr. phrase υιοι του νυμφωνος, denotes no more than the Eng. word *bridemen* does, namely the young men who, at a marriage, are attendants on the bride and

bridegroom ; whereas, the phrase in Eng. *the children of the bride-chamber*, suggests a very different idea.

[3] *Do they fast?* μη δυνανται νηστευειν ; E. T. *Can they fast?* a subject such as this, relating to the ordinary manners or customs which obtain in a country, it is usual to speak of any thing, which is never done, as of what cannot be done : because it cannot, with propriety, or without the ridicule of singularity, be done. *Μη δυνανται νηστευειν* is therefore synonymous with *μη νηστευουσι ; Do they fast?* And *ου δυνανται νηστευειν*, with *ου νηστευουσι*, *They do not fast.* As the simple manner suits better the idiom of our tongue, I have preferred it.

20. *They will fast*, νηστευσουσιν. E. T. *Shall they fast?* The expression here used does not convey a command from our Lord to his disciples, but is merely a declaration made by him occasionally to others, of what would in fact happen, or what a sense of propriety, on a change of circumstances, would induce his disciples, of themselves, to do. The import is therefore better expressed by *will* than by *shall.* At the time when the common translation was made the use of these auxiliary verbs did not entirely coincide with the present use. In the solemn style, and especially in all prophecies and predictions, *shall* was constantly used where every body, now speaking in prose, would say *will.* As that manner is (except in Scotland) become obsolete ; and as, on many occasions, the modern use serves better the purpose of perspicuity, distinguishing mere declarations from commands, promises, and threats ; I judged it better, in all such cases, to employ these terms according to the idiom which prevails at present.

24. *Which, on the Sabbath, it is unlawful to do.* Mt. xii. 2. N.

26. *Abiathar the high priest.* From the passage in the history referred to, it appears that Ahimelech, the father of Abiathar, was then the high priest.

[3] *The tabernable—the loaves of the presence.* Mt. xii. 4. N.

28. *Therefore, the Son of Man*, ωστε ὁ υιος του ανθρωπου. This is introduced as a consequence from what had been advanced, v. 27. *The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath.* Hence one would conclude, that, *the Son of Man*, in this verse, must be

equivalent to *man*, in the preceding; otherwise a term is introduced into the conclusion, which was not in the premises.

CHAPTER III.

4. *To do good—or to do evil; to save, or to kill—αγαθοποιησαι, η κακοποιησαι· ψυχην σωσαι, η αποκτειναι.* In the style of Scripture, the mere negation of any thing is often expressed by the affirmation of the contrary. Thus, L. xiv. 26. *not to love*, or even to love less, is called *to hate*; Mt. xi. 25. *not to reveal*, is *to hide*; and here, *not to do good*, when we can, is *to do evil*; *not to save*, is *to kill*. Without observing this particularity in the Oriental idiom (of which many more examples might be brought,) we should be at a loss to discover the pertinency of our Lord's argument; as the question about preference here was solely between *doing* and *not doing*. But from this, and many other passages, it may be justly deduced, as a standing principle of the Christian ethics, that not to do the good which we have the opportunity and power to do, is, in a certain degree, the same as to do the contrary evil; and not to prevent mischief, when we can, the same as to commit it.

5. *For the blindness of their minds, επι τη πωρωσει της καρδιας αυτων.* Diss. IV. § 22, 23, 24.

12. *He strictly charged them, πολλα επετιμα αυτοις.* Ch. ix. 25. N.

14. *That he might commission them to proclaim the reign, ινα αποστελλη αυτους κηρυσσειν.* Diss. VI. P. V. § 2.

21. *His kinsmen hearing this, went out, ακουσαντες οι παρ' αυτου εξηλθον.* Sir Norton Knatchbull, a learned man, but a hardy critic, explains these words as if they were arranged and pointed thus, *'Οι ακουσαντες παρ' αυτου εξηλθον*, "Qui audiverunt, sive audientes quod turba ita fureret, ab eo exiverunt." *They who heard went out from him.* He does not plead any diversity of reading, but that such transpositions of the article are often to be met with. "*Ακουσαντες οι* dicitur frequenti trajectione pro *οι ακουσαντες*." But it would have been more satisfactory to produce examples. For my part, I cannot help thinking, with Raphelius, that this transposition is very harsh, and but ill-suited to the idiom of the language.

[3] *Οι παρ' αυτου.* That this is a common phrase for denoting, *sui, propinqui, cognati*, his kinsmen, his friends, is well known. I have preferred the word *kinsmen*, as the circumstances of the story evince, that it is not his disciples who are meant, but who would most readily be understood by the appellation *friends*. Bishop Pearce is of a different opinion, and thinks that by *'οι παρ' αυτου* is meant, "rather those who were with him, or about him, that is some of the Apostles or others present." Of the same opinion is Dr. M'Knight. But I cannot find a warrant for this interpretation. *Παρα* often signifies *ad, apud, juxta, prope ; at, near, with ;* but not when joined with the genitive. It has, in that signification, regularly the dative of persons, and the accusative of things. Thus, Phavorinus, *Παρα προθεσις, ότε πλησιοτητα δηλοι, επι μεν εμψυχου, δοτικη συντασσεται· επι δε αψυχου, αιτιατικη.* He subjoins only three exceptions that have occurred to him, in all which the preposition has the accusative of the person, instead of the dative, but not a single example wherein it is construed with the genitive. The use of the preposition, in the N. T. in this signification, which is very frequent, I have found, except in one instance, where the dative of the thing, and not the accusative, is used, entirely conformable to the remark of the lexicographer. The instance is in J. xix. 25. *Ειστηκεισαν δε παρα τω σταυρω.* But in no instance have I found it with a genitive, unless when the meaning is different ; when it has either no relation to place, as appears to be the case here, or when it corresponds to the La. *a, ab*, and to the Eng. *from*. If the article did not form an insuperable objection to the disposition of the words proposed by Knatchbull, his way of rendering *παρ' αυτου εξηλθον, went out from him*, would be unexceptionable. Another insuperable objection against both the above hypotheses (for both imply that it was some of the disciples, or at least some of those who were with Jesus in the house, that went out,) is that, by the Evangelist's account, they who went out were persons who had been informed of his situation by others. *Ακουσαντες ότι παρ' αυτου.* Now, what writer of common sense would speak of men's hearing of a distress which they had seen and felt, and in which they had been partakers ? For it is said, not of him alone, but of him and his disciples, that they were so crowded, that they could not so much as eat. Nor can the participle *ακουσαντες*, in

a consistency with the ordinary rules of construction, refer to any thing but the distress mentioned in the preceding verse.

[3] *To lay hold on him*, κρατησαι αυτον. All the above mentioned critics agree in thinking that the *αυτον* refers not to *Ιησους*, but to *οχλος*, in the twentieth verse. L. Cl. also, has adopted this opinion. He renders the words *κρατησαι αυτον pour la retenir*, referring to *la multitude*, in the foregoing verse. As to the justness of this version, far from being dogmatical, he says, modestly enough in his notes, *Les mots κρατησαι αυτον, sont equivoques, et peuvent être egalement rapportez au mot οχλος qui precede, et à Jesus Christ. Si l'on suit cette construction, l' Evangeliste, voudra dire &c. mais si on rapporte ces paroles à Jesus Christ, il leur faudra donner un sens conforme*—He seems to put both ways of rendering the words on a foot of equality. Bishop Pearce is more positive, and says, in his note on this passage, our Eng. translation must certainly be a mistake. Why? Because Jesus was in a house, and therefore they who wanted to lay hold on him, could not go out for that purpose. True, they could not go out of that house; but if they who heard of his distress were in another house (and the very expression employed by the Evangelist, shows that they were not witnesses of the distress,) would there be any impropriety in saying, *They went out to lay hold on him?* I admit, with L. Cl. that the pronoun *αυτον*, may refer either to *οχλος*, or to Jesus, the subject of discourse. But that the latter is the antecedent here, is the more probable of the two suppositions, for this reason: the same pronoun occurs before, in this verse, where it is admitted, by every body to refer to *him*, and not to the *multitude*, *οι παρ' αυτου εξηλθον κρατησαι αυτον*. The interpretation, therefore, which makes it refer to *him*, though not absolutely necessary, is the most obvious, and the most conformable to the syntactic order. Further, till of late, the pronoun here has been invariably understood so by interpreters. Thus, the Vul. *Cum audissent sui, exierunt tenere eum.* It must have been *eam*, if they had understood it of the crowd, *turba*, mentioned in the preceding sentence. With this agree, in sense, all the other translations I know, ancient or modern, Oriental or European, L. Cl.'s alone excepted. The ancient commentators, Gr. and La. show not only that they understood the expression in the same way, but that they never heard of any other interpretation. Though, in matters of abstract reasoning, I am far from paying great deference

to names and authorities, their judgment is often justly held decisive in matters purely grammatical.

[4] *He is beside himself*, εξεστη. Vul. *In furorem versus est.* It shocks many persons to think, that so harsh, so indecent, a sentence concerning our Lord should have been pronounced by his relations. Several methods have, accordingly, been attempted, for eluding this sentiment entirely, or at least affixing another meaning to the word εξεστη, than that here given, though the most ancient and the most common. By the explanation Dr. Pearce had given of the preceding words (which I have assigned my reasons for rejecting,) he has avoided the difficulty altogether; what is affirmed being understood, by him, as spoken of the crowd, and not of Jesus. But he has not adverted, that to give the words this turn, is to render the whole passage incoherent. Nothing appears plainer, than that the verdict of his friends, in this verse, is the occasion of introducing the verdict of the Scribes in that immediately following. Observe the parallelism (if I may be allowed the term) of the expressions: Οι παρ αυτου εξηλθον κρατησαι αυτον, ελεγον γαρ οτι εξεστη· και οι γραμματεις οι απο Ιεροσολυμων καταβαντες ελεγον ότι Βεελζεβουλ εχει. Were the Scribes also speaking of the crowd? As that will not be pretended; to suppose that in one verse the crowd is spoken of, and in the next our Lord, though the expression is similar, and no hint given of the change of the subject, is, to say the least, a very arbitrary supposition. Now, that the sense given in the common version, which I have followed, is an ordinary meaning of the word, is not denied. Phavorinus explains it by μαινεται, and in 2 Cor. v. 13. it is contrasted with the verb σωφρονειν, in such a manner as not to admit another interpretation. Thus: Ειτε γαρ εξεστημεν, θεω· ειτε σωφρονουμεν, υμιν. It is urged, on the other side, that the word occurs in the Sep. in a different meaning, Gen. xlv. 26. εξεστη ἡ διανοια Ιακωβ. E. T. *Jacob's heart fainted.* But passing the observation, that the expression is not entirely the same, I should admit the same to be the meaning of the Evangelist, if it were mentioned as what was reported to his friends, and not as what was said by them. When they say, *he is beside himself*, every body understands it as a conclusion which they infer, on the sudden, from what they had heard. The judgment is rash and injurious, but not unnatural to people in a certain temper. The other version, *he has*

fainted, denoting a visible event, could not naturally come from those who knew nothing of what had happened, but by information from others. If it had been said, in the future *εκστησεται*, *he will faint*, the case had been different, as this would have been no more than an expression of their fears. L. Cl. was so sensible of the weight of the above mentioned objections, that though he considered the pronoun *αυτον* as relating to the crowd, he could not understand *ότι εξεστη*, which he renders *qu'il etoit tombé en defaillance*, as either spoken of the crowd, or as spoken by the friends : but, in order to keep clear of both these difficulties, he has, after Gro. adopted an hypothesis which, if possible, is still more exceptionable. He supposes, in contradiction to all appearances, that the word *ελεγον*, in this verse, is used impersonally or indefinitely, and that the same word, in the next verse, so similarly introduced, is used personally or definitely. Accordingly, he translates *ελεγον γαρ*, not *car ils disoient*, as the construction of the words requires, but *car on disoit*, thus making it not what his kinsmen inferred, but what was reported to them. If this had actually been the case, the simple, obvious, and proper, expression, in Gr. would have been : *Ακουσαντες ότι παρ αυτου οτι εξεστηκει, εξηλθον κρατησαι αυτον*. In this case, also, I should have thought it not improbable that the word implied no more than those writers suppose, namely, that he had fainted. Some are for rendering it, *he wondered*, or *was amazed*, assigning to it the same meaning which the word has ch. ii. 12. where an evident subject of wonder and amazement is first mentioned, and then the passion, as the natural effect. This way of rendering the words is exposed to objections equally strong, and more obvious. The only modern Eng. versions, that I know, which follow the common translation, are Hey. and Wes. Gro. thinks that the Sy. and Ara. favour his explanation of the word *εξεστη*. But father Si. is of a different opinion. I cannot help observing, on the whole, that in the way the verse is here rendered, no signification is assigned to the words, which it is not universally allowed they frequently bear ; no force is put upon the construction, but every thing interpreted in the manner which would most readily occur to a reader of common understanding, who, without any preconceived opinion, entered on the study. On the contrary, there is none of the other interpretations which does not (as has been shown) offer some violence

to the words, or to the syntax; in consequence of which, the sense extracted, is far from being that which would most readily present itself to an unprejudiced reader. It hardly admits a doubt, that the only thing which has hindered the universal concurrence of translators, in the common version, is the unfavourable light it puts our Lord's relations in. But that their disposition was, at least, not always favourable to his claims, we have the best authority for asserting. See J. vii. 5. with the context.

I shall conclude this long critique on the whole passage, with taking notice of a different reading on the first part of it. The Cam. (with which concur two versions, the Go. and the Cop.) substitutes *ότε ηκουσαν περι αυτου οι γραμματεις και οι λοιποι, when the Scribes and the rest heard concerning him*, for *ακουσαντες οι παρ αυτου*. Had this reading been sufficiently supported (which is far from being the case,) I should have gladly adopted it, and saved the relations.

27. *The strong one's house.* L. xi. 21. N.

29. *Eternal punishment.* Ch. xii. 40. N.

CHAPTER IV.

10. *Those who were about him, with the twelve, asked him, ηρωτησαν αυτον οι περι αυτον συν τοις δωδεκα.* Vul. *Interrogaverunt eum hi qui cum eo erant duodecim.* With this agrees the Sax. In conformity to the import, though not to the letter, of this reading, four Gr. MSS. of which the Cam. is one, instead of *οι περι αυτον συν τοις δωδεκα*, read *οι μαθηται αυτου*. This is all the countenance which the reading adopted by the Vul. has from antiquity.

24. *To you who are attentive, ύμιν τοις ακουουσιν.* E. T. *Unto you that hear.* The places are numberless, wherein the Heb. שמע *shamang*, and the Gr. *ακουειν*, signify not barely *to hear*, but *to be attentive*, to show regard to what one hears. See, amongst other passages, Mt. xviii. 15, 16. That it must be understood with this limitation here, is evident from its being preceded by the warning, *βλεπετε τι ακουετε*, and from its being followed by the words, *ός γαρ αν εχη*—where the phrases, *to have*, and *not to have*, are, on all sides, allowed to mean, in the first instance, to make, and not to

make, a good use of what one has; and, in the second, barely to possess, and not to possess. It may be proper to add, that in some noted MSS. the words *τοις ακουουσιν* are wanting; as well as in the Vul. Cop. and Ara. versions.

25. *From him who hath not, even that which he hath, shall be taken.* See the preceding N. *That which he hath,* in the last clause, is what he is possessed of. I did not think it proper to interpret the word differently, according to its different senses, because there is, here, an intended paronomasia. Mt. x. 39. N.

36. *Having him in the bark, they set sail, παραλαμβανουσιν. αυτον, ως ην εν τω πλοιω.* E. T. *They took him, even as he was, in the ship.* Vul. *Assumunt eum ita ut erat in navi.* The word *ita, even,* has not any thing in the original corresponding to it, and does not serve to illustrate the sense. With the Vul. agree most modern versions. L. Cl. indeed says, *Ils le prirent dans leur barque,* but has overlooked the *ως ην* entirely. Raphelius seems to understand the passage in the same way that L. Cl. does, and explains *ως ην, with such preparation as he had,* putting the comma after *ην,* and not after *αυτον.* With Elsner, I approve more the common interpretation. Against the other there are three principal objections: 1st. The words are not *εις το πλοιον,* but *εν τω πλοιω.* 2dly, No example of *ως ην,* in their acceptation, has been yet produced. To give, as an example, *ωσπερ ξυνεσκευασμενος ην,* is too ridiculous to require an answer. Nor is it more to the purpose, to quote phrases so different as *ως ειχεν* and *ως* and *ετυχεν.* 3dly, It does not suit the humble manner in which our Lord travelled at all times. He never affected the state of a great man; nor do we ever hear of servants, horses, or waggons, attending him with provisions. Dr. Pearce, who seems to favour that way of rendering the words, was sensible of this incongruity, and therefore explains it, *tired as he was;* but this still supposes such an ellipsis in the expression as I can find no example of.

39. *Commanded the wind.* Ch. ix. 25. N.

CHAPTER V.

1. *Gadarenes, Γαδαρηνων.* Vul. *Gerasenorum.* Mt. viii. 28. N.

3. *In the tombs, εν τοις μνημειοις.* In a very great number of MSS. amongst which are all the oldest and the best, it is *εν τοις*

μνημασι. The Com. and Ben. read so. This is one of those diversities concerning which, as the sense is not affected, we can conclude nothing from translations. I agree with Mill and Wet. in adopting it, and have, therefore, though of little consequence, rendered it *tombs,* as I commonly use *monument* in translating *μνημειον.*

7. *I conjure thee, ὁρκιζω σε.* E. T. *I adjure thee.* It was observed, on Mt. xxvi. 63. that the verbs *ὁρκιξειν* and *εξορκιξειν,* when spoken of as used by magistrates, or those in authority, denote to *adjure;* that is, to oblige to swear, to exact an oath; but when it is mentioned as used by others, and on ordinary occasions, it is better rendered to *conjure,* or to obtest solemnly.

11. *The mountain, τα ορη.* There is so great a concurrence of the most valuable MSS. early editions, Fathers, and ancient versions, in favour of *τω ορει,* in the singular, that it is hardly possible to question its authenticity. The ancient translations which corroborate this reading, are all those that are of any account with critics, the Vul. both the Sy. the Ara. the Go. the Cop. the Sax. and the Eth. Gro. Mill, and Wet. receive it.

15. *Him who had been possessed by the legion, τον δαιμονιζομενον—τον εσχηκοτα τον λεγεωνα.* The latter clause is not in the Cam. and one other MS. and seems not to have been read by the author of the Vul. who says, *Illum qui a dæmonio vexabatur.* Neither is it in the Sax.

17. *They entreated him to leave their territories, ηρξαντο παρακαλειν αυτον απελθειν απο των ὁριων αυτων.* E.T. *They began to pray him to depart out of their coasts.* It has been long observed by critics, that *αρχομαι* in scripture, before an infinitive, is often no more than an expletive, *αρχομαι λεγειν* for *λεγω,* &c. That this is sometimes the case, cannot be doubted, but as, in my judgment, it does not hold so frequently, as some imagine, I shall make a few observations for ascertaining the cases in which that verb is significant, and ought to be translated. The 1st. is, when an adverb of time appears to refer us to the special circumstance expressed by *αρχομαι.* Thus Mt. iv. 17. *Απο τοτε ηρξατο ὁ Ιησους κηρυσσειν—From that time Jesus began to proclaim*—Then was the first example he gave of the practice. So Mt. xvi. 21. The 2d is, when the scope of the

place produces the same effect, with an adverb of time. Thus we see with equal evidence that ἡ δε ἡμερα ηρξατο κλινειν. L. ix. 12. must be translated, *the day began to decline*, Αρχομενων δε τουτων γινεσθαι. L. xxi. 28. *When these things begin to be fulfilled.* Ουτος ὁ ανθρωπος ηρξατο οικοδομειν, και ουκ ισχυσεν εκτελεσαι. L. xiv. 30. *This man began to build, but was not able to finish.* These, though the clearest, are not the only cases wherein αρχομαι is not redundant. The third is, when a clause is subjoined which appears to have some reference to the particular circumstance expressed by αρχομαι. Thus Mt. xii. 1, 2. Οι μαθηται αυτου ηρξαντο τιλλειν σταχυας—Οι δε Φαρισαιοι ιδοντες ειπον. The known captiousness of the Pharisees, and their forwardness, on every occasion, to reproach our Lord, give ground to think, it was the historian's intention to suggest, that the disciples were but begun to pluck the ears of corn, when they obtruded their censure, and that, consequently, *began to pluck* is not a mere pleonasm for *plucked.* The 4th and only other case which occurs, is when αρχομαι seems to insinuate that what was done was not much, that it was of short continuance, like an action only begun. An example of this we have in Mt. xi. 20. *Ηρξατο ονειδιζειν τας τολεις. He began to reproach the cities*—Mt. xxvi. 22. ηρξαντο λεγειν εκαστος αυτων marks more strongly the abruptness and coincidence of the cry, than ελεγεν εκαστος could have done. I own, however, that the two cases last mentioned have not equal evidence with the two which precede them, and would therefore condemn no interpreter for dropping αρχομαι in both. For my part, I choose to retain it, as I think it neither quite unmeaning, nor even unsuitable to modern idioms. Si. in Fr. in these cases, sometimes renders αρχεσθαι by the verb *se mettre*, which seems equivalent. Thus *Ses disciples se mirent à arracher*—and *Il se mit à reproacher*—In other cases, particularly in the text, the redundancy of αρχομαι is manifest.

23. *I pray thee come, and lay thy hands upon her,* ινα ελθων επιθης αυτη τας χειρας. Vul. *Veni, impone manum super eam.* Perhaps the La. version of the words has arisen from a different reading in the original. The Cam. with other differences, has ελθε in the imperative. Perhaps it has been what the La. translator thought a proper expression of the sense. The conjunction ινα, with the subjunctive mood, not preceded by another verb, is justly to be regarded as

another form of the imperative. The only difference between it and an ordinary imperative is, that it is a more humble expression, serving to discriminate an entreaty from a command. In this respect it corresponds to the Heb. particle נא *na*, which, when it is subjoined to the imperative, forms, in effect, a different mood; for what two things can differ farther than *to entreat* and *to command*? Yet, to mark the difference in most languages, can be effected only by some such phrase as, *I pray thee;* which, therefore, ought not to be considered as words inserted without authority from the original, since without them the full import of the original is not expressed. It has, accordingly, been supplied in some such way in most versions. Be. says, *Rogo;* Er. Zu. and Cal. *Oro;* Dio. *Deh;* G. F. *Je te prie;* Beau. *Je vous prie.* The same may be affirmed, not only of our common version, but of the generality of Eng. translations. This remark will supersede the correction proposed by Dr. Pearce, which, though not implausible, leans too much on conjecture to be adopted here.

CHAPTER VI.

2. *And how are so great miracles,* ὁτι και δυναμεις τοιαυται. E. T. *that even such mighty works.* The conjunction ὁτι is wanting in a great number of MSS. including many of chief note, and in several of the oldest and best editions. Wet. and other writers reject it. Add to all these, that the sense is clearer without it.

3. *With us,* προς ἡμας. Vul. *apud nos.* To the same purpose the Sy. &c. The Seventy have employed προς in interpreting the Heb. *etsel,* which answers to the La. *juxta apud.* 2 Chr. xxviii. 15. Is. xix. 19. Jer. xli. 17. In the same way it is employed in the N.T. J. i. 1. ὁ λογος ἡν προς τον θεον. *The word was with God.* Is there any occasion here to recur, with Markland, to classical authors, for an application of the term which must be acknowledged to be, even in them, very uncommon?

9. *To be shod with sandals, and not to put on two coats.* The reading, in Gr. here followed, is Αλλ' ὑποδεδεμενους σανδαλια, και μη ενδυσασθαι δυο χιτωνας. Authorities are almost

equally divided between ενδυσασθαι in the infinitive, and ενδυσησθε in the imperative; for I consider, with bishop Pearce, those copies which read ενδυσασθε as favouring the former, the change of the termination αι into ε being a common blunder of transcribers. Now, though the authorities, on the other side, were more numerous than they are, the sense and structure of the discourse are more than sufficient to turn the balance. Mr. had hitherto been using the oblique, not the direct, style, in the injunctions which he reports as given by our Lord. This verse, therefore, is most naturally construed with παρηγγειλεν αυτοις in the preceding verse. It is not usual with this writer to pass, abruptly, from the style of narration, to that of dialogue, without giving notice to the reader. It is the more improbable here, as intimation is formally given in the next verse, in regard to what follows; και ελεγεν αυτοις. For, if this notice was unnecessary, when he first adopted the change of manner, it was unseasonable afterwards, as it hurt both the simplicity and the perspicuity of the discourse. I cannot help, therefore, in this instance, differing from both the late critical editors Mill and Wet.

11. *As a protestation against them*, εις μαρτυριον αυτοις. Ch. xiii. 9. N.

[2] *Verily I say unto you, the condition of Sodom and Gomorrah shall be more tolerable on the day of judgment, than the condition of that city.* The Gr. answering to this, Αμην λεγω υμιν, ανεκτοτερον κ. τ. λ. is wanting in the Cam. and three other MSS. The Vul. Sax. and Cop. also, have nothing that corresponds to it.

15. *It is a Prophet, like those of ancient times*, οτι προφητης εστιν, η ως εις των προφητων. E.T. *That it is a Prophet, or as one of the Prophets.* There is, however, such a consent of MSS. several of them of the first note, versions, as Vul. Sy. Ara. Go. Cop. Sax. and Eth. with editions, Fathers, critics, for rejecting the conjunction η, as to remove all doubt concerning it. The sentence is also more perspicuous without it. Οι προφηται, used in this manner, always meant the ancient Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah—

20. *Protected*, συνετηρει. E. T. *Observed.* On the margin we read *kept*, or *saved him*, to wit, from the effects of Herodias' resentment. This is evidently the true version. The Vul. has *custodiebat;* Ar. in the same sense, *conservabat;* Er. and the other La. transla-

tors, less properly, *observabat.* That the import of the verb is *to preserve, to protect,* appears not only from the connexion in this place, but from all the other passages in the N. T. where it occurs. Mt. ix. 17. L. ii. 19. v. 38.

[2] *Did many things recommended by him, ακουϑας αυτου, πολλα εποιει.* That Herod attended with pleasure on John's teaching, we are told, in the very next clause of the sentence, *ηδεως αυτου ηκουε.* As this ought not to be considered as a tautology, the former *ακουϑας αυτου* must be regarded only as explanatory of *πολλα εποιει,* the import of which I have given in the translation.

27. *Dispatched a sentinel, αποστειλας σπεκουλατωρα.* E. T. *Sent an executioner.* The word *executioner,* with us, means one whose office it is to execute the sentence of the law on criminals. They had not then a peculiar officer for this business. The lictors, indeed, were employed in it by those Roman magistrates who were entitled to their attendance. Other persons in authority in the provinces, commonly entrusted it to some of the soldiery. The term used by Mr. is a La. word, and properly signifies *sentinel,* watch or scout.

33. *Many, who saw them depart, and knew whither they were sailing, ran out of all the cities, got thither by land before them, Ειδον αυτους υπαγοντας οι οχλοι, και επεγνωσαν αυτον πολλοι, και πεζη απο παϑων των πολεων συνεδραμον εκει, και προηλϑον αυτους.* E. T. *The people saw them departing, and many knew him, and ran a-foot thither out of all cities, and outwent them.* There are two various readings of some moment on this passage. The first is, the omission of *οι οχλοι,* the second, the omission of *αυτον.* The authorities for both are not equal, but are, all things considered, sufficient ground for adopting them. As to the first, it is favoured by the Vul. both the Sy. the Cop. Arm. Sax. and Eth. versions, and by MSS. editions, fathers, and critics, more than necessary ; as to the second, the rejection of the pronoun is warranted by the Cam. and several other MSS. as well as by the Vul. which renders the words thus : *Viderunt eos abeuntes, et cognoverunt multi ; et pedestres de omnibus civitatibus concurrerunt illuc, et prævenerunt eos.* But what I think a superior warrant, and a kind of intrinsic evidence, that the words in question are intruders, is, that the sense, as well as the construction (which seemed embarrassed before,) is cleared by their

removal. It could not, probably, be in the sight of the multitude that our Lord and his apostles would embark, since their intention was to be private, though many might discover it, who would inform others. That the historian should say that many knew him, now after he had been so long occupied every day in teaching them, and curing their sick, and had been constantly attended by the admiring crowd, is exceedingly improbable. There would be, comparatively, but few, if any, there who did not know him. It may be said, indeed, that when the *αυτον* is excluded, there seems to be some defect, as it is not expressly said what they knew: but this is so fully supplied by the following words, which acquaint us that the people got thither before them, as to put it beyond a doubt, that what he meant to say they knew, was the place whither our Lord and his disciples intended to sail.

[2] *By land.* Mt. xiv. 13. N.

[3] *And came together to him, και συνηλθον προς αυτον.* This clause is wanting in three MSS. and in the Vul. Sy. Sax. and Cop. versions.

36. *Buy themselves bread for they have nothing to eat, αγορασωσιν εαυτοις αρτους· τι γαρ φαγωσιν ουκ εχουσι.* Vul. *emant cibos quos manducunt.* The Cam. alone in conformity to the Vul. *αγορασωσι τι φαγειν.* In two or three MSS. of little account, there are on this clause, some other inconsiderable variations.

40. *Squares, πρασιαι.* E. T. *Ranks.* The word denotes a small plat, such as a flower-bed in a garden. It has this meaning in Ecclus. xxiv. 31. I do not find it in the Sep. or in any other part of the N. T. These beds were in the form of oblong squares. Thus, Hesychius: *Πρασιαι αι εν τοις κηποις τετραγωνοι λαχανιαι.* To the same purpose, also, Phavorinus. The word is, therefore, very improperly, rendered either *ranks* or *rows.* That the whole people made one compact body, an hundred men in front, and fifty deep (a conceit which has arisen from observing that the product of these two numbers is five thousand,) appears totally inconsistent with the circumstances mentioned both by Mr. who calls them, in the plural, *συμποσια* and *πρασιαι* and by L. who calls them *κλισιαι.*

44. *Five thousand,* ὡσει πενταχισχιλιοι. We have the authority of all the best MSS. editions, and versions, Vul. both the Sy. Eth. Ara. Sax. and Cop. for rejecting ὡσει, *about.*

51. *Which struck them still more with astonishment and admiration,* και λιαν εκ περισσου εν εαυτοις εξισταντο και εθαυμαζον. The two last words are wanting in three MSS. with which agree the Vul. Sy. Sax. and Cop. versions.

52. *Their minds were stupified,* ην ἡ καρδια αυτων πεπωρωμενη, Diss. IV. § 22, 23, 24.

CHAPTER VII.

2. *With impure, (that is, unwashen) hands,* κοιναις χερσι, τουτ' εστιν ανιπτοις. E. T. *With defiled, (that is to say, with unwashen) hands.* The Gr. word rendered, here, *impure,* and in the E. T. *defiled,* literally signifies *common.* It was quite in the Jewish idiom, to oppose *common* and *holy,* the most usual signification of the latter word, in the O. T. being, separated from common, and devoted to sacred, use, Diss. VI. P. IV. § 9, &c. Their meals were (as the Apostle expresses it, 1 Tim. iv. 5.) *sanctified by the word of God and prayer.* They were, therefore, not to be touched with unhallowed hands. The superficial Pharisee, who was uniform (wherever religion was concerned) in attending to the letter, not to the spirit, of the rule, understood this as implying solely that they must wash their hands before they eat. As we learn, from antiquity, that this Evangelist wrote his Gospel in a Pagan country, and for the use of Gentile, as well as Jewish, converts, it was proper to add the explanation τουτ' εστιν ανιπτοις, to the epithet κοιναις, which might have otherwise been misunderstood by many readers. Pref. § 5.

3. *All the Jews who observe.* We must with Markland, render thus παντες οι Ιουδαιοι κρατουντες· otherwise we represent all the Jews as observing the traditions, though it is certain that the Sadducees did not observe them. To omit repeating the article before the participle, is not unexampled in these writings.

3, 4. *For the Pharisees—eat not until they have washed their hands, by pouring a little water upon them; and if they be come from the market by dipping them—*οι γαρ Φαρισαιοι—εαν μη πυγμη

νιψωνται τας χειρας, ουκ εσθιουσι,—και απο αγορας, εαν μη βαπτισωνται, ουκ εσθιουσι. E. T. *For the Pharisees—except they wash their hands oft, eat not; and when they come from the market, except they wash, they eat not.* A small degree of attention will suffice to convince a judicious reader, that there must be a mistake in this version. For if, by what we are told, v. 3. we are to understand, as is allowed by every body, that they did not eat, on any occasion, till they had washed their hands; to what purpose was this added, v. 4. *And when they came from the market, except they wash, they eat not?* Could any person suppose that, if washing before meals was a duty, their having been at the market, where they were most exposed to defilement, would release them from the obligation? Besides, there is, in the first clause, an indistinctness and obscurity which leaves the reader much at a loss for the meaning. Except they wash oft, they eat not. Does this imply, that they must wash often before every meal? or that their washing frequently before one meal will compensate for their not washing at all before another? It is well known, and indeed the circumstances of the story, as related here, and in Mt. may satisfy us, that neither of these was the case. For illustrating this passage, let it be observed, 1st, that the two verbs, rendered *wash* in the E. T. are different in the original. The first is *νιψωνται*, properly translated *wash;* the second is *βαπτισωνται*, which limits us to a particular mode of washing; for *βαπτιζω* denotes *to plunge, to dip.* This naturally suggests the idea, that the word *πυγμη*, in the first clause, added to *νιψωνται*, may express the manner of washing, and so complete the contrast in the first and second clauses. *Πυγμη*, according to the old lexicographers, signifies the fist, or the hand contracted for grasping; but I find no authority for rendering it *oft.* In modern lexicons *crebro* is admitted as one meaning. But this, I suspect, is solely because the Vul. so translates the word in this passage. The suspicion of Er. is not implausible, that the old translator had read *πυκνη*. Perhaps it is still more likely, that he had supposed *πυγμη* to have come into the place of *πυκνη*, through the blunder of some early copyist. The first Sy. translator has, from the same cause, the not understanding of the import of *τυγμη* in this place, rendered it by a word denoting *carefully*, which, though equally unwarranted, suits the sense better than *crebro.* The. who is in this followed by Euth. supposes that the word may mean *up to the elbow.* But

as neither of these seems to have been versed in Jewish ceremonies, their judgment, in a point of this kind, is of little weight. Besides, it destroys the contrast clearly indicated by the Evangelist between *νιπτειν* and *βαπτιξειν*. The opinion of Wet. I think with bishop Pearce, is on the whole, far the most probable, that the word denotes here a *handful*. This is, at least, analogical. Thus *foot*, in most languages, denotes, " the length of the foot." The like may be said of *cubit* and *span*. As the sense manifestly supplies the word *water*, the import is a handful (that is, a small quantity) of water. " *Βαπτιξεσθαι*," says that excellent critic, " est manus aquæ immergere, *νιπτεσθαι* manibus affundere." This is more especially the import, when the words are, as here, opposed to each other. Otherwise *νιπτειν* like the general word *to wash* in Eng. may be used for *βαπτιξειν*, *to dip*, because the genus comprehends the species ; but not conversely *βαπτιξειν* for *νιπτειν*, the species for the genus. By this interpretation, the words, which as rendered in the common version, are unmeaning, appear both significant and emphatical ; and the contrast in the Gr. is preserved in the translation. The Vul. does not confound the two verbs as the E. T. does : at the same time it fails in marking the precise meaning of each. *Pharisæi enim—nisi crebro lavcrint manus, non manducant : et a foro, nisi baptizeniur, non comedunt.* Ar. whose object is to trace etymology, not to speak either intelligibly or properly, renders *πυγμη pugillatim*. Be. as unmeaningly, says *pugno*. Er. Leo. Cal. and Cas. follow the Vul. the three former saying *crebro*, the last *sæpe*. None of them sufficiently distinguishes the two verbs. They use the verb *lavare*, in the active voice, in the first clause, in the passive in the second ; seeming to intimate, that in the first case the hands only were washed ; in the second the whole body. The Vul. gives countenance to this interpretation. But it ought to be observed, that *βαπτισωνται* is not in the passive voice, but in the middle, and is contrasted to *νιψωνται*, also in the middle ; so that by every rule the latter must be understood actively, as well as the former. All the modern versions I have seen, are, less or more, exceptionable in the same way.

4. *Baptisms of cups, βαπτισμους ποτηριων.* E. T. *The washing of cups.* I have chosen to retain the original word for the fol-

lowing reasons: First, It is not an ordinary washing, for the sake of cleanliness, which a man may perform in any way he thinks convenient, that is here meant; but it is a religious ceremony, practised in consequence of a sacred obligation, real or imagined. Secondly, The analogy that subsists in phraseology between the rites of the old dispensation and those of the new, ought, in my opinion, to be more clearly exhibited in translations of Scripture, than they generally are. It is evident, that first John's *baptism*, and afterwards the Christian, though of a more spiritual nature, and directed to a more sublime end, originated in the usages that had long obtained among the Jews. Yet, from the style of our Bible, a mere Eng. reader would not discover that affinity which, in this, and some other instances, is so manifest to the learned. The Heb. שבל perfectly corresponds to the Gr. *βαπτω* and *βαπτιζω* which are synonymous, and is always rendered by one or other of them in the Sep. I am not for multiplying technical terms, and therefore should not blame a translation wherein the words *baptize*, *baptism*, and others of the same stamp, were not used; if in their stead we had words of our own growth, of the same import. Only let uniformity be observed, whether in admitting, or in rejecting them; for thus we shall sooner attain the scriptural use, and discover how far the latter were analogous to the former institutions. If it be asked, why I have not then rendered *βαπτιδωνται* in the preceding clause, *baptize?* I answer, 1st, That the appellation *baptisms*, here given to such washings, fully answers the purpose; and, 2dly, That the way I have rendered that word, shows better the import of the contrast between it and *νιψωνται*, so manifestly intended by the Evangelist. The Vul. in this instance, favours this manner, saying here, *baptismata calicum*, and Heb. ix. 10. *variis baptismatibus;* but has not been imitated by later translators, not even by those who translated from the Vul. and have been zealous for retaining the words which are retained in that version, as consecrated.

9. *Ye judge well, continued he, in annulling,* και ελεγεν αυτοις, Καλως αθετειτε. E.T. *And he said unto them, Full well ye reject.* Bishop Pearce justly prefers the marginal version, *frustrate*, to the textuary *reject*. But I cannot approve his other amendment of disjoining the adverb καλως from αθετειτε, with which the structure of the sentence leads us to connect it, and prefixing it to ελεγεν, thus

making it, *he said well.* It would be a sufficient reason against this alteration, that, where there is not a good reason for changing, it is safer to follow the order of the words in the original. But were the Gr. what it is not, equally favourable to both interpretations, there is the strongest reason here for preferring the common one. It is not in the manner of these biographers, nor does it suit the taste that prevails through the whole of their writings, to introduce any thing said by our Lord, accompanied with an epithet expressing the opinion of the writer. They tell the world what he said, and what he did, but invariably leave the judgment that ought to be formed about both, to the discernment of their readers. The declared verdicts of others, whether friends or enemies, as becomes faithful historians, they also relate; but, like zealous disciples, wholly intent on exhibiting their Master, they care not though they themselves pass totally unnoticed. Their manner is exactly that of those who considered all his words and actions as far above standing in need of the feeble aid of their praise. The two examples produced by that author do not in the least justify the change, nor invalidate a syllable of what has been now advanced. In neither are they the words of the Evangelist, but of the interlocutors introduced in the history. The first is, J. viii. 48. *Οι Ιουδαιοι ειπον αυτω, Ουκαλως λεγομεν,* The Jews said to him, *Have we not reason to say?* The other is, xiii. 13. where our Lord says, *Υμεις φωνειτε με Ο διδασκαλος και Ο κυριος, και καλως λεγετε, Ye call me The Teacher, and The master, and ye say right.* I am aware that the difference may not be thought material; but I cannot help considering the slightest alteration as material, which affects the taste of these invaluable writings, and thereby tends to deprive us of an important criterion of their genuineness and divine original. Diss. III. § 18.—*Ye judge well.* This is spoken ironically. See notes on Mt. xxiii. 32. and xxvi. 45. and on J. iv. 17.

11, 12. *But ye maintain, 'If a man say to father or mother, 'Be it corban (that is, devoted) whatever of mine shall profit thee,' he must not thenceforth do aught for his father or his mother, ὑμεις δε λεγετε, Εαν ειπη ανθρωπος τω πατρι η τη μητρι, Κορβαν (ὁ εστι δωρον) ὁ εαν εξ εμου ωφεληθης· και ουκετι αφιετε αυτον ουδεν ποιησαι τω πατρι αυτου η τη μητρι αυτου. But ye say, 'If a man shall say to his father or mother, It is corban*

(*that is to say, a gift*) *by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me,' he shall be free; and ye suffer him no more to do aught for his father or his mother.* For the illustration of this passage, in which it must be acknowledged there is some difficulty, let us, first, attend to the phrase, *it is corban.* As *corban*, in the original, is not accompanied with the substantive verb, it suits better the import of the passage, to supply it in the imperative, *be it*, than in the indicative, *it is.* Whatever the man meant to do, it is evident that, by the form of words specified, the thing was done, and he was bound. The expression, therefore, ought not to imply that the obligation had been contracted before. Be. who has been followed by most modern translators, erred in inserting the verb *est.* He ought either, with the Vul. to have left the ellipsis unsupplied, or to have said, *sit*, or *esto.* *Κορβαν* is a Sy. word, which this Evangelist, who did not write in a country where that language was spoken, has explained by the Gr. word *δωρον*, and signifies here *a gift* made to God, or *a thing devoted.* Our translators say, *by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me;* that is, when expressed more fully, 'That is *corban*, whatever it be, by which thou mightest be profited by me.' Now, as to the meaning of the expression, some explain it as importing, 'Let every donation I make to God turn out to thy advantage.' And they suppose, that when a man has once said this, he is, every time he makes a present to the temple, or an oblation on the altar to be considered as discharging the duty he owes to his parents. This seems to be the sense of the Vul. *Si dixerit homo patri aut matri, Corban (quod est donum) quodcunque ex me tibi profuerit.* To the same purpose, though in different words, Er. Zu. Cal. and Cas. From Be.'s version it would be difficult to conclude what had been his apprehension of the meaning. His words are, *Si quispiam dixerit patri vel matri, Corban (id est donum) est, quocunque a me juvari posses, insons erit.* But by a marginal note on the parallel passage in Mt. he has shown that his idea was the same with that of the ancient interpreter, "Sensus est, quicquid templo donavero, cedet, in rem tuam, perinde enim est, ac si tibi dedero." There are several reasons which lead me to think, that this cannot be the sense of the words. In the first place, such a method of transferring the benefit of oblations and gifts (if compatible with their usages, which I very much doubt) would have deprived the giver of all the advantage

resulting from them. We may believe it would not suit the system of the covetous and politic Pharisees, who were the depositaries of the sacred treasure, to propagate the opinion, that the same gifts and offerings could be made equally to redound for the benefit of two or three, as of one. This would have been teaching the people an economy in their oblations and presents to the temple, which but ill suited the spirit of their doctrine. 2dly, The effect of this declaration could, at the most, only have been to release the son, who said so, from the obligation of giving any support to his father, or doing aught for him; but it could never be construed into a positive obligation to do nothing. By saying, 'I will do this for you, I will transfer to you the merit of all my oblations,' I cannot be understood to preclude myself from doing as much more as I please. Yet this was the effect of the words mentioned, as we learn from the sacred writers. Thus Mt. says expressly, that after a man has made this declaration, *ου μη τιμησει* (rather *τιμησει*, as it is in some noted MSS. and early editions,) *He shall not honour his father or his mother.* I know, that in Be.'s translation, and those which follow it, this argument is in a manner annihilated. By making the words now quoted belong to the hypothetical part of the sentence, and introducing, as the subsequent member, without warrant from the original, the words *he shall be free*, translators have darkened and enervated the whole. But that the doctrine of the Pharisees extended farther than to release the child from the duty of supporting his parents; nay, that it extended so far as to bring him under an obligation not to support them, is still more evident from what is told by Mr. *ουκ ετι αφιετε*, *Ye suffer him no more to do aught for his father or his mother.* This plainly expresses, not that he is at liberty to do nothing for them if he choose to do nothing, but that he must never after do aught for them, if he would. This appears, even from the common translation, whose words I have quoted; though the passage is greatly marred by the same unwarranted supply as in Mt. I may justly say *marred*, since the words supplied are inconsistent with those which follow. A man is free, who may do, or not do, as he pleases. This was not the case. The same act which superseded the obligation of the commandment, brought him under a counter-obligation, which, according to the Pharisaical doctrine, he was less at liberty to infringe than ever he had been with regard to the former. The method of getting rid of God's

commandment, we see, was easy ; but there was no release from their tradition. 3dly, Our Lord, in both places, mentions two commandments of the law, in regard to parents, the one enjoining honour to them, the other prohibiting, under the severest sanction, that kind of dishonour which consists in contumelious words. Both are introduced in illustration of the sentiment with which he began, that they preferred their own traditions to the commandments of God. Now the mention of the divine denunciation against those who treat their parents with reproachful language, was foreign to the purpose, if there was nothing in the maxims of the Pharisees here animadverted on, which tended to encourage such criminal conduct. But the speech of the son, as those interpreters explain it, " May every offering I make to God redound to your advantage," cannot be said to be abusive, or even disrespectful. With whatever view it may be spoken, it carries the appearance of reverence and regard. See Mt. xv. 4. N. The An. Eng. version has suggested a different meaning, to wit, that the son had actually given, or intended to give, to the temple, all that he could afford to bestow on his parents. *If any one shall tell his father or his mother, that what he could bestow for their relief is* corban, *that is, to be given to the temple ; you discharge him from the obligation of doing any thing for his father or his mother.* And in the parallel passage in Mt. it is—*is dedicated to the temple,*—though the original does not authorize the change of the tense. This meaning Mr. Harwood also has introduced into his paraphrase, which he calls a liberal translation. Mt. xv. 5. *But you, in direct opposition to this divine command, say, That whosoever dedicates his substance to pious and religious uses, is under no obligation to relieve an aged and necessitous parent.* And Mr. vii. 11, 12.—*that, if any man bequeath his fortune to the service of the temple, from that moment he ceases to be under any obligation at all, to relieve the most pressing wants of his aged and necessitous parents.* I do not think it necessary to attempt a refutation of this opinion, or, rather, these opinions ; for more ways than one are suggested here, and a sort of casuistry, which, by the way, savours more of the corruptions of the church than of those of the synagogue. Only let it be observed, that the second and third arguments urged against the former hypothesis, serve equally against this ; to which I shall add, that, as no Jewish customs have been

alleged in support of it, it is far from being what the words would naturally suggest. If such had been our Lord's meaning, the obvious expression would have been, not, If a man say to his father, but If a man dedicate or bequeath to the temple. Whereas the efficacy in the text is laid entirely on what he says, not on what he does, or intends to do. For my part, I agree with those who think that, by the expression which I have rendered, *be it devoted, whatever of mine shall profit thee*, the son did not directly give, or mean to give, any thing to God; he only precluded himself from giving any relief to his parents. For if he should afterwards repent of his rashness, and supply them with any thing, he had by (what I may call) eventually devoting it to God, given, according to the Pharisaic doctrine, the sacred treasury a title to reclaim it. Gro. is of opinion, that this chance of eventual profit to the treasury, whereof the priests, and the leading men of the Pharisees, had the management, contributed not a little to the establishment of such impious maxims. The words, therefore, *be it corban*, or *devoted*, involve an imprecation against himself, if he shall ever bestow any thing to relieve the necessities of his parents; as if he should say to them, 'May I incur all the infamy of sacrilege and perjury, if ever ye get a farthing from me;' than which we can hardly conceive any thing spoken by a son to his parents, more contemptuous, more unnatural, more barbarous, and consequently more justly termed κακολογια, *opprobrious language*. Lightfoot quotes a passage from a Rabbinical performance, which sets the intent of such expressions in the clearest light. When a man had a mind to make a vow against using any particular thing, suppose wine, he said, Let all the wine that I shall taste be *conem*, a word of similar import with *corban*. By saying so, it was not understood that he devoted any thing to God, but that he bound himself never to taste wine. And if, notwithstanding this, he was afterwards induced to drink wine, he became both sacrilegious and perjured; sacrilegious, because the wine was no sooner tasted by him than it was sacred; perjured, because he had broken his vow; for such declarations were of the nature of vows. It appears from Maimonides, that the term came, at length, to denote any thing prohibited. To say, It is *corban* to me, is to say, I dare not use it; to me it is all one as though it were consecrated to God. In the above explana-

tion, we are supported by the authority of Gro. Capellus, Lightfoot, all deeply conversant in Jewish literature; with whom also agree these later critics, L. Cl. Beau. Wh. Wet. Pearce, and several others. Some of our late Eng. translators seem also to have adopted this interpretation. The only difficulty that remains in the sentence arises from the conjunction *και*, which, in sentences conditional or comparative, where the concluding member has an immediate dependence on the preceding, appears to break the natural connexion, by forming one of a different kind. To this I answer, with Gro. that the *και*, in the N. T. like the Heb. ו, is sometimes a mere expletive, and sometimes has the power of other conjunctions. I shall mention some of the examples in the Gospels, referred to by that author. The learned reader may compare the original with the common translation, Mt. xxviii. 9. L. ii. 15. 21. v. 35. ix. 51. In all these, the translators have dropped the copulative entirely. In L. ii. 27, 28. they have rendered it *then*, and in L. xiv. 1. *that*. Every impartial person will judge whether it be a greater latitude in translating to omit a conjunction, which, in certain cases not dissimilar, is allowed to be an expletive, or to insert, rather interpolate a whole clause, which is not only not necessary, but not altogether consistent with the rest of the passage. The last clause, v. 12. is here rendered more according to the sense, than according to the letter. 'Ye maintain—he must not do,' is entirely equivalent to, 'Ye do not permit him to do:' for it was only what they permitted or prohibited by their doctrine, of which he was speaking. But the former is the only way here of preserving the tenor of the discourse. In the latter, the first member of the sentence is in the words of the Pharisees, the second in the words of our Lord.

19. *It entereth not into his heart, but into his belly, whence all impurities in the victuals pass into the sink, ουκ εισπορευεται αυτου εις την καρδιαν, αλλ' εις την κοιλιαν, και εις τον αφεδρωνα εκπορευεται, καθαριζον παντα τα βρωματα.* E. T. *It entereth not into his heart, but into the belly, and goeth out into the draught, purging all meats.* A late learned prelate, whom I have had occasion often to quote, proposes a different version of the above passage. The way in which he would render it, as may be collected from his commentary and notes, is this; *It entereth not into his heart, but into his stomach, and goeth out into the lower part of*

the belly, which purgeth all meats. Κοιλια, he says, commonly rendered *belly,* is often used for στομαχος, *stomach.* Thus, Mt. xii. 40. Jonah is said to have been, εν τη κοιλια, in the belly [that is, *stomach*] of the great fish. But, let it be observed, that the Gr. word κοιλια, in no other way, imports στομαχος, than as the Eng. word *belly,* imports *stomach.* With us it is equally proper to say, that Jonah was in *the belly,* as that he was in *the stomach* of the fish. Thus we say of gluttons, that all their care is to fill their bellies. Yet in such cases we could not say that either the Gr. word, or the Eng. is used in an acceptation different from the common. Whatever goes into the stomach, goes into the belly, of which the stomach is a part. Whosoever goes to Rome goes to Italy. It is common to every language often to express the part by the whole, and the species by the genus. This kind of synecdoché is so familiar, and even so strictly proper, as hardly to deserve a place among the tropes. Let it be observed farther, that when a more extensive or general term is used, every thing advanced must be suited to the common acceptation of the term. Thus I may say indifferently, that our food goes into the stomach, or into the belly; but if I use the latter term, I cannot add, it passes thence into the intestines (these being also in the belly,) which I might have added, if in the first clause I had used the word stomach. The same holds also of the corresponding expressions in Gr. and for the same reason. Yet, in this glaringly improper manner, does the Evangelist express himself, if αφεδρων, as the Bishop explains it, mean a part of the belly. If it were necessary to go farther into this examination, it might be observed, that αφεδρων, by the explanation produced from Suidas and Pasor, which makes it, at the most, answer only to the *intestinum rectum,* will not suit his purpose, the secretion of the chyle being more the work of the other intestines. Let it, at the same time, be remembered, that the version *latrina, secessus,* is admitted, on all sides, to be according to the common meaning of the word. Add to this, that καθαριζον is susceptible of an easy explanation on this hypothesis. It agrees with παν; but παν does not relate to βρωματα. It must be explained from the subject treated, παν κοινον, παν ακαθαρτον. Nor can any thing be clearer than the meaning and construction, when the words are thus explained: 'Any impurity that should enter from without, with the food, into

the body, can never contaminate the man, because it nowise affects his mind, but passeth into his belly, whence it is thrown out into the sink, leaving what is fit for nourishment, clear of all dregs and defilement.' Gro. has well expressed the last clause, *Si quid est in cibo naturalis immunditiæ, id alvo ejectum purgat relictum in corpore cibum.* No interpretation more effectually exposes the cavil reported by Jerom. Our Lord's words, so far from implying that all that is swallowed is thrown out of the body, imply the contrary. The other interpretation requires also, that we do violence to the words, in reading καθαριζοντα for καθαριζον, without the sanction of a single MS. edition, ancient version, or early writer.

22. *Insatiable desires*, πλεονεξιαι. E. T. *Covetousness.* The use of the word πλεονεξια in the Sep. warrants interpreters to render it *covetousness*, in the N. T. But in every place where the word occurs, it does not seem to be properly limited to that meaning. Phav. and Suid. both define it ἡ ὑπερ της επιθυμιας του πλειονος βλαβη, they add, παρα τω αποστολω, because it is not the common classical use. Now as this definition is applicable to more vices than *avarice*, there are some passages in Scripture where the sense requires it should be rendered by a more comprehensive term. This is particularly the case when the plural number is employed, as here, and 2 Pet. ii. 14.

24. *Having entered a house*, ειδελθων εις την οικιαν. But a great number of MSS. many of them of the first note, have no article. Some of the earliest and best editions have none. The Sy. and the Go. interpreters have not read the article. It is rejected by Wet. and most critics.

26. *A Greek*, Ἑλληνις. This woman is called, Mt. xv. 21. *Canaanitish ;* here *a Syrophenician*, and *a Greek.* There is in these denominations no inconsistency. By birth, she was of *Syrophenicia ;* so the country about Tyre and Sidon was denominated ; by descent, of *Canaan*, as most of the Tyrians and Sidonians originally were ; and by religion, *a Greek*, according to the Jewish manner of distinguishing between themselves and idolaters. Ever since the Macedonian conquests, Greek became a common name for idolater, or at least one uncircumcised, and was held equivalent to Gentile. Of this we have many examples in Paul's Epistles, and

in the Acts. *Jews and Greeks*, Ἕλληνες, are the same with *Jews and Gentiles.*

31. *Leaving the borders of Tyre and Sidon, he returned,* παλιν εξελθων εκ των ὁριων Τυρου και Σιδωνος, ηλθε. Vul. *Iterum exiens de finibus Tyri, venit per Sidonem.* Agreeable to which are the Cop. and the Sax. versions, as well as the Cam. and two other MSS. which, instead of the three last words in Gr. read ηλθε δια Σιδωνος. What may have recommended this reading to Dr. Mill, it has no external evidence worth mentioning, and is, besides, in itself, exceedingly improbable. Our Lord's ministry was to the Jews; and to their country he appears to have confined his journeys. Even Si. and Maldonat, though both, especially the last, not a little partial to the Vul. give the preference here to the common Gr. Maldonat says, "Credendum non est, Christum in urbes Gentilium ingressum fuisse, qui non nisi ad oves quæ perierant domûs Israel se missum dixerat."

32. *Who had an impediment in his speech,* μογιλαλον. Vul. *mutum.* This deviation from the meaning is not authorised by a single MS.

33. *Spat upon his own fingers, and put them into the man's ears, and touched his tongue,* εβαλε τους δακτυλους αὐτου εις τα ωτα αυτου, και πτυσας ἡψατο της γλωσσης αυτου. E. T. *put his fingers into his ears, and he spit and touched his tongue.* The reference of the prououn *his* is here quite indeterminate. The Cam. MS. gives a better arrangement πτυσας εβαλε κ ἑ. Two other MSS. say εβαλε τους δακτυλους αὐτου εις τα ωτα αυτου, και ἡψατο— Though one or two copies are of no authority; yet as there is no doubt about the meaning, that arrangement in Eng. which conduces most to perspicuity, ought to be preferred.

34. *Ephphatha.* Pr. Mt. § 19.

CHAPTER VIII.

12. *No sign shall be given to this generation,* ει δοθησεται τη γενεα ταυτη σημειος. As the negative in the original is expressed by the conditional particle ει *if*, Simon, in his note on the place,

mentions this as an argument, that the words aré of the nature of an oath. " Cette particle *si* semble indiquer le serment." It is true that, among the Hebrews, the form of an oath by imprecation was very common. *God do so to me, and more also,* said Ruth to her mother-in-law, *if aught but death part thee and me.* This was an oath that she would not leave her. Sometimes there was an ellipsis of the curse, and no more than the hypothetical clause was expressed. In this case, the conditional conjunction had the force of negation, if there was no negative in the sentence ; and the contrary effect, if there was. But as use in every tongue gradually varies, it is manifest, and might be proved by examples, that the conditional particle came, at length, in many cases, to be understood merely as a negative. That it is so here, we need no better evidence, than that, in all the other places of the Gospels, where we have the same declaration, what is here expressed by *ει δοθησεται σημειον*, is expressed in them by *σημειον ου δοθησεται*. Mt. xii. 39. xvi. 4. and L. xi. 29.

24. *Having looked up, και αναβλεψας*. E. T. *And he looked up. Αναβλεπειν* sometimes signifies *to recover sight*, sometimes *to look upwards* to an object situated above us, sometimes *to raise our eyes* from looking downwards, or even from a state of passiveness to exertion. In this sense, *to look up* is often used in Eng. As the subject, here, is the cure of a blind man, many are led to prefer the first of these senses. My reasons, for thinking differently, are as follows : 1st, When *αναβλεπειν* in the Gospel, signifies *to recover sight*, it indicates a complete recovery, which was not the case here. 2dly, If it denote, here, *he recovered his sight*, there is a contradiction in the passage, as the same reason would lead us to infer, from the very next verse, that he had not recovered it ; for Jesus, after doing something further, *εποιησεν αυτον αναβλεψαι* made him again look up. 3dly, Because the man's recovering his sight is expressed by a distinct clause, *αποκατεσταθη και ενεβλεψε τηλαυγως*. There is no reason to adopt the second meaning mentioned, as the objects he had to look at appear to have been on a level with himself. The third sense, therefore, which is that of the E. T. seems entitled to the preference. The application is similar to that in the Sep. Is. xlii. 18. *Οι τυφλοι αναβλεψατε ιδειν*. E. T. *Look, ye blind, that ye may see.* That the word is sometimes used for looking at things not placed above us, is also evident from L. xxi. 1.

[3] *I see men, whom I distinguish from trees only by their walking,* βλεπω τους ανθρωπους ὡς δενδρα περιπατουντας. E. T. *I see men as trees walking.* But in many MSS. some of them of principal note, in several old editions, and in the commentaries of The. and Euth. the words are, βλεπω τους ανθρωπους, ὁτι ὡς δενδρα ὁρω περιπατουντας. This reading is preferred by both Mill and Wet. and is preferred by Cas. and some modern interpreters. Thus, the sentence is made to consist of two members, whereof the second is introduced as the reason for saying, in the first, that he saw men. I have endeavoured to give a just expression of the sense in the version.

26. *Neither go into the village, nor tell aught to any of the villagers,* μηδε εις την κωμην εισελθης, μηδε ειπης τινι εν τη κωμη. Vul. *Vade in domum tuam ; et si in vicum introieris, nemini dixeris.* This version has evidently sprung from a different reading; as there has been, in fact, a great deal of variety here, both in MSS. and in versions. The Sy. and a good majority of MSS. favour the common reading. Some have thought that there is an impropriety in that reading, as it seems to suppose they could relate the miracle to people in the village, though they did not enter it. But the words, ὁι εν τη κωμη, are no more than a periphrasis for the villagers.

28. *And others, one of the Prophets,* αλλοι δε ένα των προφητων. Vul. *Alii vero quasi unum de Prophetis.* In conformity to which, the Cam. alone reads ὡς before ένα. But no translation, not even the Sax. concurs here with the Vul.

31. *He began to inform them,* ηρξατο διδασκειν αυτους. Ch. v. 17. N.

[2] *Be rejected,* αποδοκιμασθηναι. This word is, probably, used in reference to the expression in the Psalms, *The stone which the builders rejected,* ὁν απεδοκιμασαν, as it is rendered by the Seventy.

37. *What will a man not give? τι δωσει ανθρωπος;* E. T. *What shall a man give ?* Gro. justly observes, that τι, here, is equivalent to ποσα ; *How much ! What great things !* The emphasis is better expressed in our language, by the negative, which, however strange it may appear, more exactly hits the sense, than a literal version.

[3] *Ransom,* ανταλλαγμα. E. T. *Exchange.* The Gr. word means both ; but the first is, in the present case, the only proper

term in Eng. We ransom what by law, war, or accident, is forfeited, and in the power of another, though we may still be in possession : but we always exchange what we have for what we have not. If a man's life be actually taken, it is too late for bartering.

CHAPTER IX.

12, 13. *And (as it is written of the Son of Man)*, *και πως γεγραπται επι τον υιον του ανθρωπου.* E. T. *And how it is written of the Son of Man.* Twelve MSS. amongst which are the Al. and two others of note, read *καθως* for *και πως*. I cannot help thinking this a sufficient warrant for receiving it, when, by the rules of construction, no proper meaning can be drawn from the words as they lie. The Vul. and Zu. follow the common reading, and render *πως quomodo.* Er. Cas. Cal. say *quemadmodum ;* which may be interpreted either way. Be. whether it was that he judged *καθως* the true reading, or that he thought *πως*, here of the same import, renders it *ut.* In this he has been followed by the G. F. which says *comme*, and Dio. who says *sicome.* It gives an additional probability, that a similar clause, v. 13. relating to John, as this does to Jesus, which seems, in some respect, contrasted with it, is ushered in with the conjunction *καθως*, *καθως γεγραπται επ' αυτον.* This clause is very generally understood, by interpreters, as relating to the coming, not to the sufferings, of the Baptist. I have, therefore, for the sake of perspicuity, transposed it.

20. *No sooner did he see him, ιδων αυτον.* An ambiguity in both expressions, but such as, explained either way, hurts not the the import of the passage.

23. *If thou canst believe, το ει δυναϑαι πιϑτευϑαι.* Vul. *Si potes credere.* The Sy. literally the same. I see little occasion here for criticism. The *το* is wanting in so great a number of MSS. that one who thinks the construction embarrassed by it, is excusable in rejecting it. And even if allowed to remain, it will not be pretended that such superfluous particles are entirely without example. The turns given to the words, by Gro. by Knatchbull, and other critics, though ingenious, are too artificial.

24. *Supply thou the defects of my faith, βοηθει μου τη απιϑτια.* E. T. *Help thou mine unbelief.* It is evident, from the preceding

clause, *πιστευω* that *απιστια* denotes, here, a *deficient faith.* not a total *want of faith.* I have used the word *supply*, as hitting more exactly what I take to be the sense of the passage. Gro. justly expresses it, *Quod fiduciæ meæ deest, bonitate tua supple.* His reason for not thinking that the man asked an immediate and miraculous increase of faith, appears well founded: "Nam ut augmentum fiduciæ ab Jesu speraverit, et quidem subito, vix credibile est." The words, however, in the way I have rendered them, are susceptible of either meaning, and so have all the latitude of the original.

25. *He rebuked, επετιμησε.* Vul. *Comminatus est*; that is, *severely threatened.* In this manner the Gr. word is rendered in the Vul. no fewer than eight times in this Gospel, where it occurs only nine times. This is the more remarkable, as in the Gospels of Mt. and L. where we often meet with it, it is not once so rendered, not even in the parallel passages to those in Mr. No. La. translator, that I know, has in this imitated the Vul. Some say *objurgavit;* some *increpavit*, or *increpuit.* Beau. who says *menaça*, and Lu. who says **hedrauete**, are the only persons I know, who, in translating from the Gr. into modern languages, have employed a word denoting *threatened.* If there were more evidence than there is, that this is one usual acceptation of the term, there would still be sufficient ground for rejecting it as not the meaning of the Evangelists. For, 1st, the verb *επιτιμαω* is used when the object addressed is inanimate, as *the wind, the sea, a natural disease;* for though, in such cases, even when rendered *rebuke* or *command*, there is a prosopopeia; yet, as we immediately perceive the sense, the expression derives both lustre and energy from the trope; whereas the mention of threats, which always introduces the idea of punishment to be inflicted on disobedience, being nowise apposite to the subject, could serve only to render the expression ridiculous. 2dly, The Evangelists have often given us the very words of the *επιτιμησεις* used by Jesus, but in no instance do we discover in them any thing of the nature of menace. We have one example in this very verse, for it is *επετιμησε λεγων.* 3dly, The same word is adopted, Mt. xvi. 22. to express the rebuke given by Peter to his Master, in which it would be absurd to suppose that he employed threats. 4thly, The Gr. commentator Euth. has given, on Mt. xii. 16. the word *παρηγγειλε* as synonymous to *επετιμησε.* 5thly, Recourse to threats, in the orders given to individuals, would ill suit either the meekness, or the

dignity of character uniformly supported by our Lord. Even the verb *εμβριμαομαι*, though nearer in its ordinary signification to that of the La. *com-minor*, yet in no place of the Gospels, can properly be rendered *to threaten*. It is twice used by J. for *to groan*, or *to sigh deeply*. There are only two other passages in which it is applied to our Lord, once by Mt. and once by Mr. In both places the words he used are recorded, and they contain no *threatening* of any kind. The only term for *threat*, in these writers, is *απειλη*, for *to threaten*, *απειλειν* and *προσαπειλειν*.

29. *This kind cannot be dislodged unless by prayer and fasting.* *Τουτο το γενος εν ουδενι δυναται εξελθειν, ει μη εν προσευχη και νηστεια.* E. T. *This kind can come forth by nothing but by prayer and fasting.* Some doubts have been raised in regard to the meaning of the words *this kind*. The most obvious interpretation is, doubtless, that which refers them to the word *demon* immediately preceding. But as, in the parallel passage in Mt. xvii. 19. mention is made of *faith*, as the necessary qualification for dispossessing demons: Knatchbull, and others, have thought that *this kind* refers to the *faith* that is requisite. But to me it appears an insurmountable objection to this hypothesis, that we have here the same sentiment, almost the same expression, and ushered in with the same words, *this kind*, though, in what goes before, there is no mention of faith, or of any thing but demon, to which it can refer. It would be absurd to suppose that the pronouns and relatives in one Gospel refer to antecedents in another. Every one of the Gospels does, indeed, give additional information; and, in various ways, serves to throw light upon the rest. But every Gospel must be a consistent history by itself; otherwise an attempt at explanation would be in vain. Now, my argument stands thus: The story, related in both Gospels is manifestly the same; that the words in question may refer to *demon* in Mt. no person, who attentively reads the passage, can deny; that they cannot refer to *faith*, but must refer to *demon* in Mr. is equally evident. Either, then, they refer to *demon* in both, or the Evangelists contradict one another. Other arguments might be mentioned: one is, that the application of *γενος*, to an abstract quality, such as *faith*, is, I suspect, unexampled in the language of Scripture; whereas, its application to different orders of beings, or

real existences, is perfectly common. Some have considered it as an objection to the above explanation, that it supposes different kinds of *demons;* and that the expulsion of some kinds is more difficult than that of others. I answer, 1st, The objection is founded entirely in our ignorance. Who can say that there are not different kinds of demons? or, that there may not be degrees in the power of expelling? Revelation has not said that they are all of one kind, and may be expelled with equal ease. I answer, 2dly, By *this kind*, is not meant this kind of demons, but this kind or order of beings called demons. And if there be any implicit comparison in the words, it is with other cures. Another objection is, that in Mt. xvii. 20. the power of expulsion is ascribed solely to faith; whereas, here, it is ascribed to prayer and fasting. The answer to this objection will, perhaps, show, that the question does not so much affect the import of the passage, as it affects the grammatical construction and literal interpretation of the words. By the declaration, *This kind cannot be dislodged, unless by prayer and fasting*, we are not, (as I apprehend) to understand, that a certain time was to be spent in prayer and fasting, before the expulsion of every demon; but that the power of expelling was not otherwise to be attained. *Quod est causa causæ*, say dialecticians, *est etiam causa causati.* This is conformable to the idioms which obtain in every tongue. It was evidently concerning the power of expelling that the disciples put the question, *Why could not we*—? Now, to the attainment of that power, fasting and prayer were necessary, because they were necessary to the attainment of that faith, with which it was invariably accompanied. That εξελθειν should be used according to the import of the Heb. conjugation *hophal*, may be supported by many similar examples in the N. T.

37. *Not me, but him who sent me*, that is, 'not so much me as him who sent me.' Mt. ix. 13. [3] N.

40. *Whoever is not against you is for you*, Ος ουκ εστι καθ ἡμων. ὑπερ ἡμων εστιν. But in a great number of MSS. some of them of note, in several editions, in the Vul. both the Sy. versions, the Sax. and the Go. the reading is ὑμων in both places, which is also preferred by Gro. Mill, and Wet.

44. 46. 48. *Their worm——and their fire.* Οσκωληξ αυτων ——και το πυρ. Diss. XII. P. I. § 30.

CHAPTER X.

1. *Came into the confines of Judea through the country upon the Jordan,* · *ερχεται εις τα ὁρια της Ιουδαιας δια του περαν Ιορδανου.* Vul. *Venit in fines Judææ ultra Jordanem.* The Sy. and the Go. appear to have read in the same manner as the Vul. agreeably to which *δια του* is omitted in some MSS.

12. *If a woman divorce her husband.* This practice of divorcing the husband, unwarranted by the law, had been (as Josephus informs us) introduced by Salome, sister of Herod the Great, who sent a bill of divorce to her husband Costobarus ; which bad example was afterwards followed by Herodias and others. By law, it was the husband's prerogative to dissolve the marriage. The wife could do nothing by herself. When he thought fit to dissolve it, her consent was not necessary. The bill of divorce, which she received was to serve as evidence for her, that she had not deserted her husband, but was dismissed by him, and consequently free.

19. *Do no injury, μη αποστερησης.* E. T. *Defraud not.* This does not reach the full import of the Gr. verb, which comprehends alike all injuries, whether proceeding from force or from fraud, and is therefore better rendered by P. R. *Vous ne ferez tort à personne.* This is followed by Sa. Beau. and even by Si. himself, who, changing only the mood, says, *Ne faites torte à personne.* In the same way, Dio. has also rendered it. *Non far danno a niuno ;* here rightly following Be. who says, *Ne damno quemquam afficito.* To the same purpose, the Vul. *Ne fraudem feceris ;* by the sound of which, I suspect, our translators have been led into the version, *Defraud not,* which does not hit the meaning of the La.

21. *Carrying the cross, αρας τον σταυρον.* These words are not in the Ephrem and Cam. MSS. . There is nothing corresponding to them in the Vul. Sax. and Cop. versions. Mt. x. 38. N.

25. *Pass through, διελθειν.* There is the same diversity of reading here, which was observed in the parallel place in Mt. xix. 24. But the other reading, *εισελθειν,* is not here so well supported by either MSS. or versions.

29. See the Note immediately following.

30. *Who shall not receive now, in this world a hundred fold, houses, and brothers, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands, with persecutions.* There are two difficulties in these words, of which I have not seen a satisfactory solution. The first is, in the promise, that a man shall receive in this world, *a hundred-fold, houses, and brothers*—— The second is in the limitation, *with persecutions.* As to the first, there is no difficulty in the promise, as expressed by the Evangelists Mt. and L. To say, barely, that men shall receive a hundred-fold, for all their losses, does not imply that the compensation shall be in kind; nor do I find any difficulty in the declaration, that thus far their recompense shall be in this world. James, i. 2. advises his Christian brethren to *count it all joy when they fall into divers temptations.* Paul, 2 Cor. vii. 4. says, concerning himself, that he was *exceeding joyful in all his tribulation.* The same principle which serves to explain these passages, serves to explain the promise of a present recompense, as expressed by Mt. and L. The Christian's faith, hope, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost, were more than sufficient to counterbalance all his losses. But if the mention of *houses and brothers*——, add nothing to the meaning of those Evangelists, to what purpose was it made by Mr.? Instead of enlightening, it could only mislead, and make a retribution in kind be expected in the present life. Some things are mentioned, v. 29. of which a man can have only one: these are *father* and *mother.* In v. 30. we have *mothers*, but not *fathers. Wife* is mentioned, v. 29. but not *wives*, v. 30. Hence that profane sneer of Julian, who asked whether the Christian was to get a hundred wives. As to these omissions, however, there are some varieties in MSS. and versions. In. v. 29. the word γυναικα is wanting in two MSS. as well as in the Vul. Cop. Arm. and Sax. versions. None, indeed, in v. 30. have either γυναικα or γυναικας, but many MSS. and some of note, read μητερα; many also add και πατερα; though these words, in the singular, ill suit the εκατονταπλασιονα, which precedes them. These differences and omissions also contribute to render the passage suspected. According to rule, if one was repeated, all should have been repeated; and the construction required the plural number in them all. Bishop Pearce suspects an interpolation, occasioned by some marginal correction, or gloss,

which must have been afterwards taken into the text. If the text has been in this way corrupted, the corruption must have been very early, since the repetition in v. 30. though with some variety, is found in all the ancient MSS. versions, and commentaries extant. In a case of this kind, I do not think a translator authorised to expunge a passage, though he may fairly mention the doubts entertained concerning it. In a late publication of Mr. Wakefield's, (*Silva Critica*) this passage is explained in such a manner (Sect. 83.) as makes the words *now in this world, a hundred-fold, houses, and brothers, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands, with persecutions*, to signify just nothing at all. I own, I am not fond of a comment that destroys the text, or, which amounts to the same thing, exhibits it as words without meaning. Besides, the promise here is so formally divided into two parts, one regarding the present life, the other the future, that it may be fairly questioned whether such a total annihilation of one essential part, does not bring the significance of the other, at least, under suspicion. See Mt. xxvi. 29. [2] N.

[2] As to the other question about the qualifying words, *μετα διωγμων*, I observe that the Cam. and one other MS. read *διωγμου*, agreeable to which is the Sy. version : but this makes no alteration in the sense. I observe also, that there are three MSS. none of them of any name, which read *μετα διωγμον*, *after persecution*. Wet. who commonly pays no regard to conjectural emendations, has, nevertheless, adopted this. A promise, according to the letter, regarding things merely temporal, to be accompanied *with persecutions*, that learned and ingenious critic considered as illusory. The more a man has, in that situation, his distress is the greater. He subjoins : "Omnia vero plana erunt, si, quæ etiam ingeniosa D. Heinsii conjectura fuit, sequamur codices qui habent *μετα διωγμον*. Atque ita promituntur halcyonia et pacata tempora duris successura." Thus. Druthmar, a Benedictine monk of the ninth century, who wrote a commentary on Mt. considers the riches and power of the Pope, as a clear fulfilment of the promise with regard to Peter, who put the question, and the large endowments of the monasteries as a fulfilment to the rest. "Nunc quoque magnum regnum habet Petrus de villis et servis per omnem mundum, et ipse et omnes sancti, propter amorem Dei." I own that, to me, all things do not appear so plain, even

after the alteration proposed by Wet. If this promise, of temporal prosperity, be understood as made to individuals, how is it fulfilled to the martyrs, and to all those who continue to be persecuted to the end of their lives? But if it be understood, as those interpreters seem to fancy, of the church in general, which, after a state of persecution for near three centuries, was put by Constantine in a state of security and prosperity; the following questions will naturally occur: Do not the words here used, manifestly imply that the promise was intended for every disciple who should come within the description? Thus, v. 29. *Ουδεις εστιν ὁς αφηκεν—There is none who shall have forsaken*—30. *εαν μη λαβη—who shall not receive.* The Evangelists, Mt. and L. are equally explicit on this head. *Πας ὁς αφηκεν—Whosoever shall have forsaken—ληψεται—shall receive*—are the words of Mt. And in L. it is, *Ουδεις εστιν ὁς αφηκεν—There is none who shall have forsaken—ὁς ου μη απολαβη—who shall not receive.*—It is impossible for words to make it clearer. Now, could the promise be said to affect the actual sufferers, as the words certainly imply, if all that it meant was, 'If ye, my hearers, have given up, or shall give up, every thing for my sake, houses, lands, friends;——those who shall be in your places, three hundred years hence, who have suffered nothing, being themselves perhaps good for nothing, and have lost nothing, shall be richly rewarded for what ye have done, and shall live in great opulence and splendour.' If understood, therefore, of an enjoyment which every persecuted individual would obtain here, after all his sufferings were over, it is not true; for many died in the cause: and, if understood of the church in general, it is not to the purpose; nor can it, by any interpretation, be made to suit the terms employed. For my part, if I were, with Heinsius and Wet. to account *μετα διωγμον, after persecution*, the true reading, I should heartily agree with those who consider this as a strong evidence of the millennium; for in no other way that I know, can it be consistently interpreted. I have other objections against that interpretation which makes it relate to the change that the church was to undergo, after being established by the imperial laws. If our Lord's kingdom had been, what it was not, a worldly kingdom; if greatness in it had resulted, as in such kingdoms, from wealth and dominion, there would have been reason to consider the reign of Constantine as the halcyon days

of the church, and a blessed time to all its members. But if the reverse was the fact; if our Lord's kingdom was purely spiritual; if the greatness of any member resulted from his humility and usefulness; and if superior authority arose purely from superior knowledge and charity; if the riches of the Christian consisted in faith and good works, I am afraid the changes, introduced by the emperor, were more the corrupters, than the establishers of the kingdom of Christ. The name, indeed, was extended, the profession supported, and those who assumed the name, when it became fashionable, and a means of preferment, multiplied; but the spirit, the life, and the power, of religion, visibly declined every day. Let us not, then, shamefully, confound the unrighteous Mammon with the hidden treasures of Christ. Those divine aphorisms, called the beatitudes, which ascribe happiness to the poor, the meek, the mournful, the hungry, the persecuted, were not calculated for a particular season, but are evidently intended to serve as fundamental maxims of the Christian commonwealth to the end of the world. Though there be, therefore, some difficulty in reconciling the words, *with persecutions*, with what is apparently a promise of secular enjoyments, it is still preferable to the other reading; both because the correction is a mere guess, and because it is less reconcileable than this, to the state of the church militant, in any period we are yet acquainted with. For it will ever hold, that all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall, in some shape or other, suffer persecution. And to reject, on mere conjecture, because of a difficulty, real or apparent, all that Mr. has additional to what is recorded by Mt. and L. would be contrary to all the rules of sound criticism; and might give rise to a freedom which would be subversive of the authority of Scripture altogether.

40. *I cannot give*, *ουκ εστιν εμον δουναι*. Vul. *Non est meum dare vobis*. In the addition of *vobis*, this interpreter is almost singular, having no warrant from MSS. and being followed only by the Sax. version. It is, besides, but ill adapted to the words in connexion. The same peculiarity in the two versions occurs also in Mt. xx. 23.

42. *Those who are accounted the princes*, *οι δοκουντες αρχειν*. E. T *They which are accounted to rule*. The Gr. expression, suitably to a common idiom both in sacred, and in classical, authors, may be rendered simply, as though it were *οι αρχοντες*, *the princes;*

but I think there is, here, an energy in the word δοκουντες, as denoting those whom the people acknowledge, and respect, as princes. It also suits the sense better to use the name *princes* here, than the verb *to rule*, which is not so well adapted to the preceding participle, *accounted*. The word *princes*, denoting strictly and originally no more than *chief men*, it may, not improperly, be regarded as merely a matter of public opinion, who they are that come under this denomination. But we cannot, with propriety, express ourselves in the same doubtful way of those who actually govern, especially when they govern, as represented here, in a severe and arbitrary manner.

46. *Son of Timeus.* This may be no more than an interpretation of the name, for so *Bartimeus* signifies; in which case the words τουτ' εστι, as in *Abba, father*, which occurs oftener than once, are understood.

48. *Charged him to be silent*, επετιμων αυτω ινα σιωπηση. See notes on Mt. xx. 31. and ch. ix. 25.

CHAPTER XI.

1. *As far as Bethphage and Bethany*, εις Βηθφαγη και Βηθανιαν. Βηθφαγη και are not in the Cam.; nor are there any words corresponding to them in the Vul. and the Sax. versions.

10. Immediately after βασιλεια, in the common Gr. copies, we read the words, εν ονοματι Κυριου, *in the name of the Lord;* but they are wanting in several MSS. some of them of principal note, and in the Vul. Sy. Cop. Arm. Ara. and Sax. versions. Origen did not read them. And they are rejected by Gro. Mill, and Ben. Their situation between βασιλεια and its regimen, του πατρος ημων, gives them much the appearance of an interpolation. Besides, the phrase, ερχομενος εν ονοματι Κυριου, in the preceding verse, accounts very naturally for the inadvertency of giving ερχομενη here the same following. There is, therefore, some reason for rejecting these words, but none, that I know, for rejecting the whole clause.

[2] *In the highest heaven.* L. ii. 14. N.

13. *For the fig-harvest was not yet*, ου γαρ ην καιρος συκων. E. T. *For the time of figs was not yet.* Waving the different hy-

potheses that have been adopted for explaining this expression, Dr. Pearce has, from several passages in sacred writ, particularly Mt. xxi. 34. justly observed, that by the time of any kind of fruit or grain, is meant the time of reaping it. This, indeed, coincides with the interpretation which a reader would naturally give it. What can the time of any fruit be, but the time of its full maturity? And what is the season of gathering, but the time of maturity? But figs may be eaten for allaying hunger, before they be fully ripe; and the declaration, that the season of figs was not yet come, cannot be (as the order of the words, in the original, would lead one at first to imagine) the reason why there was nothing but leaves on the tree: for the fig is of that tribe of vegetables, wherein the fruit appears before the leaf. But if the words, *και ελθων επ' αυτην, ουδεν ευρεν ει μη φυλλα*, be read as a parenthesis, the aforesaid declaration will be the reason of what immediately preceded, namely, our Lord's looking for fruit on the tree. The leaves showed that the figs should not only be formed, but well advanced; and the season of reaping being not yet come, removed all suspicion that they had been gathered. When both circumstances are considered, nothing can account for its want of fruit, but the barrenness of the tree. If the words had been *ουδεν ευρεν ει μη ολυνθους, ου γαρ ην καιρος συκων, he found nothing but green figs, for it was not the time of ripe fruit;* we should have justly concluded that the latter clause was meant, as the reason what is affirmed in the former; but, as they stand, they do not admit this interpretation. A transposition, entirely similar, we have in ch. xvi. 3, 4. The idiom of modern tongues, requiring a more rigid adherence to the customary arrangement, I have thought it reasonable to transpose the clauses. And, for removing all ambiguity, I have, after Bishop Pearce [See his Answer to Woolston on the miracles] rendered *καιρος συκων* the *fig-harvest*, (though this application of the word *harvest* is rather unusual) than by a phrase so indefinite as *the time of figs*.

15. *The temple.* Mt. xxi. 12. N.

17. *My house shall be called a house of prayer for all nations, ότι ὁ οικος μου οικος προσευχης κληθησεται πασι τοις εθνεσιν.* E. T. *My house shall be called, of all nations, the house of prayer.* Our translators have followed Be. who renders the passage, as if the last

words had been ὑπο παντων των εθνων. *Domum meam domum precationis vocatum iri ab omnibus gentibus ;* and is, I think, the only La. translator, who, by inserting the preposition *ab*, has perverted the sense. He has been copied, as usual, by the G. F. *Ma. maison sera appellée maison d'oraison par toutes nations.* This is an error of the same sort with that which was observed on Mt. v. 21. See the note on that verse. The court of the Gentiles, a part of το ιερον, *the temple*, as it is expressed in this passage, was particularly destined for the devout of all nations, who acknowledged the true God, though they had not subjected themselves to the Mosaic law, and were accounted aliens. The proselytes who had received circumcision, and were by consequence subject to the law, were on the same footing with native Jews, and had access to the court of the people. Justly, therefore, was the temple styled *a house of prayer for all nations.* The error in the common version is here the more extraordinary, as, in their translation of Isaiah, they render the passage quoted *for all people.*

* There is another error in the common version, in this passage, which, for aught I know, is peculiar to it. Οικος is rendered *the house*, not *a house*, as it ought to be. This difference, though on a superficial view it may appear inconsiderable, is, in truth, of the greatest moment. *The house of prayer* was the utmost that a Jew could have said of the temple of Jerusalem. To represent all the Gentiles, most of whom knew nothing about it, and the rest, at the furthest, put it on no better footing than the idol-temples of the surrounding nations, as using a style which implied that it was, by way of eminence, the place of all the earth appropriated to divine worship, is both misrepresenting the fact, and misrepresenting the sacred writers, who are far from advancing any thing that can be justly so interpreted.

18. *For they dreaded him*, εφοβουντο γαρ αυτον. I see no reason, with Pearce, to reject αυτον, on so slight authority as six or seven MSS. Their fear of the people, mentioned in other passages, so far from being inconsistent, naturally led them to dread one who had so great an ascendancy over the minds of the people, who exposed the hypocrisy of the spiritual guides of the age, and was so much an enemy to their traditions, and casuistry.

21. *Which thou hast devoted, ην κατηραω.* E. T. *Which thou cursedst.* In Eng. the word *cursed* is not, now, so commonly, nor I think, so properly, applied to inanimate things. Besides, that acceptation of the verb *to curse*, to which our ears are most familiarized, associates, in our minds, the idea of something, at once so atrocious, and so vulgar, as makes one dislike exceedingly the application of it, to a solemn act of our Lord, intended to convey instruction, in the most striking manner, on two important articles, the power of faith, and the danger of unfruitfulness under the means of improvement. *Devoted*, though sometimes used in a different sense, is here so fixed in meaning, by the words connected, that it is impossible to mistake it; and is surely a more decent term than *cursed.*

22. *Have faith in God, εχετε πιστιν Θεου.* That is, say some, *Have a strong faith.* The words rendered literally are, *Have a faith of God.* It is a known Hebraism, to subjoin the words *of God* to a substantive, to denote great, mighty, excellent; and to an adjective, as the sign of the superlative. In support of this interpretation, bishop Pearce has produced a number of passages, universally explained in this manner. The context here will suit either explanation. Though this is a point on which no one ought to be decisive, I cannot help, upon the whole, preferring the common version. My reasons are these: 1st, I find that the substantives construed with *Θεου*, when it signifies great or mighty (for it is only with these we are here concerned,) are names either of real substances, or of outward and visible effects. Of the first kind are, *prince, mountain, wind, cedar, city;* of the second are, *wrestling, trembling, sleep;* but nowhere, as far as I can discover, do we find any abstract quality, such as, faith, hope, love, justice, truth, mercy, used in this manner. When any of these words are thus construed with God, he is confessedly either the subject, or the object, of the affection mentioned. 2dly, The word *πιστις*, both in the Acts, and in the Epistles, is often construed with the genitive of the object, precisely in the same manner as here. Thus, Acts iii. 16. *πιστις του ονοματος αυτου* is *faith in his* [Christ's] *name;* Rom. iii. 22. *πιστις Ιησου Χριστου* is *faith in Jesus Christ.* See, to the same purpose, Rom. iii. 26. Gal. ii. 16. 20. iii. 22. Philip. iii. 9. *ελπις* is used in the same way, 1 Thess. i. 3. As these come much

nearer the case in hand, they are, in my judgment, more than a counterpoise to all that has been advanced in favour of the other interpretation.

CHAPTER XII.

4. *They wounded in the head with stones, λιθοβοληϑαντες εκεφαλαιωσαν.* Vul. *In capite vulneraverunt.* Agreeably to this version, the Cam. and five other MSS. omit *λιθοβοληϑαντες.* The Cop. and Sax. translations following the same reading.

14. *Is it lawful to give tribute to Cæsar or not ? Shall we give, or shall we not give ? εξεστι κηνσον Καισαρι δουναι, η ου ; δωμεν, η μη δωμεν ;* Vul. *Licet dare tributum Cæsari, an non dabimus?* With this agree the Go. and the Sax. The Cam. omits the whole clause *δωμεν η μη δωμεν ;*

19. *Moses hath enacted, Μωσης εγραψεν.* E. T. *Moses wrote.* The word *γραφειν*, when applied to legislators, and spoken of laws, or standing rules, is, both in sacred use, and in classical, *sancire, to enact.*

29. *The Lord is our God : The Lord is one, Κυριος ὁ Θεος ἡμων· Κυριος εἱς εϑτι.* E. T. *The Lord our God is one Lord.* The words are a quotation from Moses, Deut. vi. 4. as rendered by the Seventy. In Heb. they run thus, יהוה אלהינו יהוה אחד, literally in Eng. *Jehovah our God Jehovah one.* In such sentences, there is no substantive verb in Heb. (as in European languages) to connect the words. Their juxtaposition is held sufficient. Sometimes in Gr. and La. which do not labour under the same defect, the verb is omitted as unnecessary. Now, in my apprehension (and in this I agree with Vitringa,) the words quoted ought to be rendered as two sentences ; in Deut. thus, *Jehovah is our God : Jehovah is one ;* and not as one sentence, *Jehovah our God is one Jehovah.* My reasons are these : 1st, It appears to have been the purpose of their great legislator to establish among the people these two important articles, as the foundation of that religious constitution he was authorized to give them. The first was, that the God, whom they were to adore, was not any of the acknowledged objects of worship

in the nations around them, and was, therefore, to be distinguished among them, the better to secure them against seduction, by the peculiar name *Jehovah*, by which alone he chose to be invoked by them. The second was the unity of the divine nature, and consequently that no pretended divinity (for all other gods were merely *pretended*) ought to be associated with the only true God, or share with him in their adoration. There is an internal probability in this explanation, arising from the consideration that these were notoriously the fundamental articles of their creed. 2dly, In the reply of the Scribe, v. 32. which was approved by our Lord, and in which we find, as it were, echoed every part of the answer that had been given to his question, there are two distinct affirmations with which he begins; these are, *There is One God;* and *there is only one*, corresponding to *The Lord is our God*, and *the Lord is one.* The first clause, in both declarations, points to the object of worship; the second, to the necessity of excluding all others. Accordingly, the radical precept relating to this subject, quoted by our Lord, Mt. iv. 10. from the Sep. is exactly suited to both parts of this declaration. *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God.* This may be called the positive part of the statute, and corresponds to the article, *The Lord is our God. Thou shalt serve him only.* This is the negative part, and corresponds to the article, *The Lord is one.* 3dly, Such short and simple sentences, without either verb or conjunction to unite them in themselves, or connect them with one another, are not unfrequent in the sacred language. An example, perfectly similar, we have, Exod. xv. 3. יהוה איש מלחמה (or, as we read in the Samaritan Pentateuch, יהוה נבור במלחמה) יהוה שמו rightly rendered in the E. T. as two distinct sentences. *The Lord is a man of war; The Lord is his name:* by Houbigant, *Dominus est bellator fortis; dominus est nomen ejus.* 4thly, It is unexampled in sacred writ, to join אחד as an adjective to a proper name. The case is different, when it is affirmed as an attribute, because then the copula or substantive verb is understood. For though the Gr. word κυριος, be an appellative, we ought to remember that, in this passage, it supplies the place of *Jehovah*, a proper name. Now a proper name, which naturally belongs but to one, does not admit numeral adjectives. If such an adjective, therefore, be subjoined to the name, it ought to be considered as something formally predicated of it, not as

an epithet or attendant quality. If the whole purpose of the quotation were to assert, in one sentence, the unity of the Godhead, the only natural expression in Heb. would have been יהוה, אלהינו אלהים אחד, in Gr. *κυριος ὁ Θεος ἡμων Θεος εἱς εστι. Jehovah*, or *The Lord our God is one God.* But, as it stands, if it had been meant for one simple affirmation, the expression would have been both unnatural and improper. The author of the Vul. seems, from a conviction of this, to have rendered the words, in defiance of the authority of MSS. *Deus unus est.* In Deut. he says, indeed, *Dominus unus est.* But in some old editions, previous to the revisal and corrections of either Sixtus V. or Clement VIII. the reading is, as in Mr. *Deus unus est.* I have consulted two old editions in folio, one printed at Paris 1504, the other at Lyons 1512, both of which read in this manner.* Some may say, and it is the only objection I can think of, that though my interpretation might suit the Heb. of Deut. it does not suit the Gr. of the Evangelist. We have here the substantive verb *εστι*, which, as it is used only once in the end, seems to connect the whole into one sentence. I answer, that it is not uncommon in the penmen of the N. T. to use the copula in the last short sentence or member, and leave it to be supplied by the reader's discernment in the preceding. Thus, Mt. xi. 30. *Ὁ ζυγος μου χρηστος, και το φορτιον μου ελαφρον εστι.* Here every body admits, that we have two distinct affirmations, and that the *εστι*, which occurs only in the end, must be supplied in the former clause, after *χρηστος.*

[z] *Our God, ὁ Θεος ὑμων.* Three MSS. read *ὑμων;* one reads *σου.* Vul. *Deus tuus.*

34. *Nobody ventured to put questions to him, ουδεις ετολμα αυτον επερωτησαι.* E. T. *No man durst ask him any question.* These words convey a suggestion of some stern prohibition, or terrible menace, denounced by our Lord, which frightened every body from further attempts this way. But this was not the case. The people saw how completely those were foiled who tried to ensnare

* Since I wrote the above, I have seen an edition of the Vul. earlier than either of these, printed at Venice, 1484, in which also the expression is *Deus unus est.* These are all the editions of that Translation of an older date than the Council of Trent, which I have had occasion to see.

him by captious questions; and how ill those succeeded, who entered into disputation with him, and were therefore naturally led, from respect to a superiority so great, and so manifest, to avoid exposing their own ignorance, or bad intention. This is sufficiently expressed in the version. J. xxi. 12. [2] N.

40. *Punishment*, κριμα. E. T. *Damnation.* But this word with us, is confined to the *punishment of hell*, to which the impenitent will be hereafter condemned. I think it unwarrantable, in a translator, to limit the words of the sacred penmen to this meaning, when neither the terms used, nor any thing in the context, can be said to limit them. The phrases κρισις της γεεννας and αιωνιος κριθις, literally, *the punishment of hell*, and *eternal punishment*, are the only terms in the Gospels which may be properly rendered *damnation.* And even in these I think it preferable, for an obvious reason, to use the periphrasis of the sacred writer. By the frequent, unnecessary, and sometimes censurable, recourse of translators to the terms, *damned*, *damnation*, *damnable*, and others of like import, an asperity is given to the language of most modern translations of the N. T. which the original evidently has not. Ch. xvi. 16. [3] N.

41. *The treasury*, του γαζοφυλακιου. This name seems to have been given to those chests into which the money devoted for the use of the temple and the sacred service was put. The first account we have of such a repository, is in 2 Ki. xii. 9. But the chest mentioned there seems to have been intended for receiving only the money brought in by the priests, as it was set in the court of the priests, near the altar, a place to which they only had access; whereas the treasury here meant, was accessible to people of all ranks and both sexes, as we learn from our Lord's remark on the gift of a poor widow. It must, consequently, have been in the court of the women, beyond which they were not permitted to go. *Gazophylacium*, from signifying the chest which contained the treasure, came to denote the place in the temple where the chest was deposited. We find our Lord, J. viii. 20. teaching in *the treasury*; that is, I suppose, in that side of the court of the women where the sacred treasure was kept.

42. *Two mites, which make a farthing.* Diss. VIII. P. I. § 10.

CHAPTER XIII.

8. *Famines and commotions*, λιμοι και ταραχαι. Vul. *Fames.* The Cop. Sax. and Eth. read as the Vul. *Και ταραχαι* are wanting in the Cam. and one other MS.

9. *To bear testimony to them*, εις μαρτυριον αυτοις. E. T. *For a testimony against them.* Vul. *In testimonium illis.* Thus also, Mt. x.18. εις μαρτυριον αυτοις και τοις εθνεσι. E. T. renders, *For a testimony against them and the Gentiles.* But, in Mt. xxiv. 14. εις μαρτυριον πασι τοις εθνεσι is translated, *For a witness unto all nations.* This is evidently the most natural interpretation, and suits the usual import of the dative case. Nor is there aught in the context of any of the three passages that would lead one to interpret it differently from the rest. The change, consequently, appears capricious. In one place indeed, namely, ch. vi. 11. the words in connexion sufficiently warrant the change of the preposition. But that the construction there is rather unusual, may be concluded from the parallel passage, L. ix. 5. where the words are, εις μαρτυριον επ' αυτους, a phrase which occurs in no other part of the Gospel. Be. was the first translator who, in the verse under review, introduced the preposition *adversus.*

11. *Have no anxiety beforehand, nor premeditate what ye shall speak*, μη προμεριμνατε τι λαλησητε, μηδε μελετατε. Vul. *Nolite præcogitare quid loquamini.* The latter clause, answering to μηδε μελετατε is wanting here, and in the Cop. and Sax. versions. So it is also in the Cam. and four other MSS.

[2] *Foretold by the prophet Daniel*, το ρηθεν υπο Δανιηλ του προφητου. This clause is not in the Cam. and three other MSS. of some note. It is wanting also in the Vul. Cop. Sax. and Arm. versions.

32. *Or.* The common Gr. copies have και ; but if we judge from the value, as well as number, of MSS. which read η, and from the support this reading has in the ancient writers and versions, we cannot hesitate to admit it as genuine.

[3] *Hour*, ωρας. This word may be rendered *season.* Mt. viii. 13. N.

35. *In the evening*—These are the four night watches, answering with us to the hours of nine and twelve at night, three and six in the morning.

CHAPTER XIV.

3. *Of Spikenard, ναρδου πιστικης.* Vul. *Nardi spicati.* Critics have been divided about the exact import of this term. Some have thought that it has arisen from the La. name *nardus spicatus*, the latter part of which denoting the species of the plant, has, by some accident, been corrupted into *πιστικης*. Others consider this word only as an epithet, expressive of the purity or fineness of the balsam. In the former way the Vul. translates it, in the latter the Sy. As in meaning, however, they pretty much coincide, the *spikenard* being accounted the most precious kind of *nard;* it seemed better to make no alteration on the word which our translators have adopted from the Vul.

[2] *She broke open the box, συντριψασα το αλαβαστρον.* E. T. *She brake the box.* Some late translators, not seeing any necessity for breaking the box, in order to get out the liquor, have chosen to say *shook.* Blackwall (Sac. Clas. vol. ii. p. ii. ch. 3.) thinks that the breaking refers to the parts of the liquor, which would be so separated by shaking, as to diffuse their fragrance wider, and flow easier. *Συντριβειν*, I acknowledge, does not always mean *to break;* perhaps oftener *to bruise.* *Συντριβεσθαι*, however, always implies that there is violence, and that the thing spoken of has sustained damage. Now it is evident, that it is not the liquor to which the verb is applied, but the box. For though, by a common figure, the containing for the contained, the box might be used to denote the liquor; these two are here so contradistinguished, that the trope can hardly have place. The historian had told us, that the woman had *αλαβαστρον μυρου ναρδου πιστικης πολυτελους.* After naming the box, the liquor is specified. To this, as being last mentioned, the participle *συντριψασα* might refer, if nothing were subjoined; but the repetition of *αλαβαστρον* after *συντριψασα*, ought, by the syntactic order, expressly to exclude that interpretation; as it could be intended only to prevent a wrong reference to *μυρον.* The *συντριψασα*, therefore, whatever it denotes, must regularly refer to the box. This, say they, is not the usual method of taking out the liquor; but it may be sometimes a necessary method. Nor does it follow, as a consequence of breaking the box, that the liquor must be lost. The effect would depend entirely on the form of the vessel,

and the manner of breakiug it. We may strike off the neck of a bottle or flaggon, without spilling the liquor. I have, however, chosen the words *broke open*, as sufficiently denoting that it required an uncommon effort to bring out the contents, which is all that the word here necessarily implies. And it is a circumstance that ought not to be altogether overlooked, being an additional evidence of the woman's zeal for doing honour to her Lord. That the term ought not to be rendered *shook*, is to me evident. I know no example of it in this meaning in any author, sacred or profane. Verbs denoting *to shake*, frequently occur in scripture. But the word is never συντριβω, but τινασσω, σειω, σαλευω.

14. *The guest chamber*, το καταλυμα. L. ii. 7. ¹ N.

15. *Furnished*, εστρωμενον. I have followed the E. T. in rendering the Gr. word by a general term. To make a stricter interpretation intelligible to ordinary readers, would require more circumlocution than it would be proper to introduce into so simple a narrative. The Eng. word, which comes nearest the import of the Gr. is *carpeted*. But when this term is used, as here, of a dining-room, it is not meant (as without an explanation would occur to us) only of the floor, but of the couches on which the guests reclined at meals. On these they were wont, for the sake both of neatness and of conveniency, to spread a coverlet or carpet. As this was commonly the last thing they did in dressing the room, it may not improperly be employed to denote the whole.

22. *Take, eat, this is my body*, λαβετε, φαγετε, τουτο εστι το σωμα μου. Vul. *Sumite, hoc est corpus meum*. The same defect is in both the Sy. the Cop. the Ara. the Sax. and the Eth. versions. The Al. and some other noted MSS. omit φαγετε.

30. *Even thou*. Though, in the common Gr. we have not the pronoun συ after ὁτι, it is found in so great a number of MSS. many of them of principal note, in so many ancient versions, fathers, and early editions, that it has been generally received by critics. That συ is emphatical in this place there can be no doubt. Peter's solemn declaration ended with these words, αλλ' ουκ εγω. Our Lord's words ὁτι συ stand directly opposed to them. It may be added, that the pronoun, in the learned languages, being in such cases unnecessary for expressing the sense, because its power is included in the verb,

is hardly ever mentioned but with an emphasis, which can rarely be transfused into modern tongues without the aid of some particle, as here of the adverb *even*.

41. *All is over, απεχει.* E. T. *It is enough.* This expression is here both indefinite and obscure. L. Cl.'s version is nearer the point. *C'est une affaire faite*, or An. *'Tis done.* The intention was manifestly to signify that the time wherein they might have been of use to him by their counsel and comfort, was now lost; and that he was in a manner already in the hands of his enemies.

43. *Clubs.* L. xxii. 52. N.

51. *Who had only a linen cloth wrapt about his body, περιβεβλημενος σινδονα επι γυμνου.* E. T. *Having a linen cloth cast about his naked body.* Bp. Pearce supposes this to have been a tunic, or vestcoat, the garment worn next the skin (for shirts, as necessary as we imagine them, appear to be of a later date, unless we give that name to a linen tunic:) but the words in connexion, *περιβεβλημενος επι γυμνου*, lead us to think that this was a loose cloth cast carelessly about him. The historian would never have added *επι γυμνου*, speaking of the tunic, or, as we commonly render it, *coat*, which was always *επι γυμνου*, close to the body. By this, on the contrary, he signifies that the man had on no tunic, and was consequently obliged to make his escape naked, when they pulled off his wrapper. Besides, a man's appearing only in his tunic was nothing extraordinary, and would never have excited the attention of the soldiers. The common people, on ordinary occasions, or when employed in manual labour, seldom appeared otherwise. What our Lord says, ch. xiii. 16. *Let not him who shall be in the field turn back to fetch his mantle*, is an evidence of this; for these two, *the tunic* and *the mantle*, completed their dress.

[2] *The soldiers, οι νεανισκοι.* E. T. *The young men.* A common denomination for soldiers among the Greeks. Had the Evangelist said *νεανισκοι τινες*, or simply *νεανισκοι*, I should have rendered it *young men.* The definite expression *οι νεανισκοι* points to a known part of the company, which could be no other than *the soldiers.* Though this incident, recorded by Mr. may not appear of great moment, it is, in my opinion, one of those circumstances we call a picturesque, which, though in a manner unconnected with the

story, enlivens the narrative, and adds to its credibility. It must have been late in the night, when (as has been very probably conjectured) some young man, whose house lay near the garden, being roused out of sleep by the noise of the soldiers and armed retinue passing by, got up, stimulated by curiosity, wrapt himself (as Casaubon supposes) in the cloth in which he had been sleeping and ran after them. This is such an incident as is very likely to have happened, but most unlikely to have been invented. It is proper to add that *ὁι νεανισκοι* are wanting in the Cam. and two other MSS. with which agree the Vul. Sy. Cop. Ara. and Sax. versions.

53. *All the chief priests*, *παντες ὁι αρχιερεις*. Vul. *Omnes sacerdotes*. The interpreter seems to have read *ἱερεις*. But this reading is not warranted by any MS. or version, except the Sax.

56. *Were insufficient*, *ισαι ουκ ησαν*. E. T. *Agreed not together*. Vul. *Convenientia testimonia non erant*. Between these two ways of rendering this passage, translators have been divided. Er. and Zu. are the only La. translators I have seen who agree with that here given, *nec erant satis idonea*. The Fr. translations also of P. R. L. Cl. and Beau. the Eng. An. and Wes. concur with mine. On a doubtful point, where the words appear susceptible of either interpretation, one ought to be determined by the circumstances of the case. Now there is nothing, in the whole narrative, that insinuates the smallest discrepancy among the witnesses. On the contrary, in the Gospels, the testimony specified is mentioned as given by all the witnesses. The differences in Mt. and Mr. one saying, *I will rebuild*, another, *I can rebuild ;* one adding, *made with hands*, another omitting it, not only are of no moment in themselves, but are manifestly differences in the reports of the Evangelists, not in the testimony of the witnesses ; nor are they greater than those which occur in most other facts related from memory. What therefore perplexed the pontiffs and the scribes, was that, admitting all that was attested, it did not amount to what could be accounted a capital crime. This made the high-priest think of extorting from our Lord's mouth, a confession which might supply the defects of evidence. This expedient succeeded to their wish. Jesus, though not outwitted by their subtilty was noway disposed to decline suffering, and, therefore, readily supplied them with the pretext they wanted.

59. *Defective.* See the last note.

61. *The Son of the blessed One, ὁ υἱος του ευλογητου.* Vul. *Filius Dei benedicit.* In the Al. and other two MSS. we read *Θεου του ευλογητου.* But it is entirely suitable to the Heb. idiom, to employ the adjective *ευλογητος*, without the noun, as a distinguishing appellation of God.

70. The clause *και ἡ λαλια σου ὁμοιαξει* is wanting in the Cam. and three other MSS. with which agree the Vul. Cop. and Sax. versions.

72. *Reflecting thereon, he wept, επιβαλων εκλαιε.* E. T. *When he thought thereon, he wept.* There are not many words in Scripture which have undergone more interpretations than this term, *επιβαλων.* The Vul. perhaps from a different reading, followed by Er. Zu. Cas. and Cal. says, *Cœpit flere.* In this also agree the Sy. the Sax. and the Go. versions. Ar. *Separans se flevit.* Be. *Quum se proripuisset, flevit.* Dio. *Si mise a piangere.* G. F. after Be. *S'estant jetté hors il pleura.* P. R. Beau. and L. Cl. as Dio. *Il se mit a pleurer.* Hey. *He burst into tears.* Almost all our other Eng. versions of this century, An. Dod. Wes. Wor. Wy. have it, *He covered his head,* or *his face, and wept.* Schmidius and Raphelius have, warmly, but not, in my judgment, successfully, defended Be.'s version, making *επιβαλλειν* to mean, *se foras proripere sive ejicere, to rush out.* Elsner has clearly shown, that the examples produced in support of this interpretation, conclude nothing ; and that the word, as its etymology suggests, denotes more properly, *to rush in,* than to *rush out.* Accordingly, when it is construed with a preposition, the preposition is always *εις*, or *επι*, never *εξ* or *απο.* He, therefore, prefers an explanation which had been first given by The. and afterwards defended by Salmasius, and others : *Having covered his head, he wept.* Yet the Gr. commentator does not give this as the certain meaning of the word ; but mentions two interpretations, leaving it to the reader to make his choice. His words are, *επιβαλων, γαρ φησιν, εκλαιε, τουτ' εστιν, επικαλυψαμενος την κηφαλην, η αντι του, αρξαμενος μετα σφοδροτητος.* But has any authority been produced for rendering *επιβαλλειν*, by itself, *to cover the head?* The authority of The. himself, a writer of the eleventh century, especially on a point of which he is evidently doubtful, will not go far. Pains have been taken to evince that the Greeks

and Romans (for nothing, if I remember right, has been affirmed of the Jews) had such a custom; but not that it was ever expressed by the single word *επιβαλλω*. It is natural in a man who weeps, to endeavour to hide his face; not so much to conceal his emotion, as to conceal the effect of it, the distortion it brings upon his countenance. But the matter of consequence to Peter, was to conceal his emotion altogether. Now, he could not have taken a more effectual method of publishing it to all around him, than by muffling up his head in his mantle. This could not fail to attract the attention of many who had no opportunity of observing the change on his features. I consider the version of this word in Dio. Beau. and L. Cl. as made from the Vul. or the Cam. the only Gr. copy which reads *ηρξατο κλαιειν*. Hey's seems to be a free version of The.'s *αρξαμενος μετα σφοδροτητος, εκλαιε*. In regard to what appears to have been the oldest manner of translating the word *επιβαλων*, *he began;* I should, with Palairet, have no objection to it, had the words been *επεβαλε κλαιειν*, and not *επιβαλων εκλαιε;* for though, no phrase in Scripture is more common, than *he began to do*, for *he did;* we do not find a single instance in which the first verb is expressed by the participle, and the second by the indicative mood (I might add, or in which *επιβαλλειν* is used for *to begin;*) now the form, in idiomatic phrases, must be carefully observed, for they hardly ever convey the same sense, when differently construed. Simon of the Oratory, after Gro. makes this participle equivalent to the Heb. יסף *addens*. But it is remarkable, that though the verb *επιβαλλω* occurs very often in the version of the Seventy, they have not once used it in translating the Heb אסף which is also a very common verb. Palairet follows Ham. who has given a version which differs from all the preceding, *He looked upon him* [Jesus,] *and wept*. But our former question recurs, Where do we find *επιβαλλω* without any addition, used in this sense? Not one quotation where the verb is not followed by *οφθαλμους, οψεις*, or *ομματα*, has been brought in support of this meaning. The meanings would be endless which might be given it, should we form an interpretation from every word that may be construed with *επιβαλλω*. After weighing, impartially the above and other explanations, I think, with Wet. that the sense exhibited by the E. T. is the most probable. That there is an ellipsis in the words, is undeniable. Now, we can never plead use in fa-

vour of a particular signification of an elliptic term, but when we can show that such is the meaning of the word where there is the same ellipsis. To say *επιβαλλειν* means *to look upon*, because *επιβαλλειν οφθαλμους* has that meaning; or that it signifies *to cover the face*, because *βαλλειν φαρη επ' ομματων* has that signification, appears to me so extraordinary a mode of reasoning, that I am surprised to find critics of undoubted learning and discernment adopting it. If I should produce examples of *επιβαλλειν τον νουν*, or *την διανοιαν*, as signifying to think of a thing, to reflect upon it, than which nothing is easier; I should give full as much probability to this signification of the word *επιβαλλειν*, when alone, as has been given by any quotations I have yet seen, to the most plausible of the meanings above mentioned. But more can be said here. The verb by itself is explained by Phavorinus, as admitting this interpretation. *Επιβαλλει ουν τις νοηματι η εργω, ηγουν ηκριβωμενως και επιτυχως νοει, ὁ και επιβολως φαμεν.* Suidas explains *επιβολη* by *εννοια.* And of the word used singly in this acceptation, Wet. has produced clear examples from Polybius, Theophrastus, Plutarch, Diodorus Siculus, Diogenes Laertius, and several others, to which I refer the learned reader; and shall only add, that if these authorities do not put the matter beyond all question, they, at least, give it a greater probability than has been yet given to any of the other hypotheses.

CHAPTER XV.

5. *Answered no more, ουκετι ουδεν απεκριθη.* E. T. *Yet answered nothing.* But this implies that he had answered nothing to the former question; the reverse of which is the fact, as appears, v. 2. and is justly observed by bishop Pearce. All the La. translators say rightly, *Nihil amplius respondit*, or what is manifestly equivalent. All the foreign translations, I have seen, give the same sense. Yet, to show how difficult it is to preserve an uniform attention, and how liable, at times, even judicious persons are to run blindfolded into the errors of their predecessors, it may be observed, that Wes. is the only modern Eng. translator who has escaped a blunder, not more repugnant to the fact, as recorded in the verses immediately preceding, than contradictory to the import of the Gr. expression here used. His version is, *Answered nothing any more.* The rest, without exception, say, *Still answered nothing*, or words to

that purpose. Yet, in the G. E. the sense was truly exhibited, *Answered no more at all.*

7. *Who in their sedition had committed murder,* οἵτινες ἐν τῇ στάσει φόνον πεποιηκεισαν. Vul. *Qui in seditione fecerat homicidium.* No MS. authorizes this rendering.

8 *With clamour the multitude demanded,* Ἀναβοησας ὁ ὀχλος ἠρξατο αιτεισθαι. Vul. *Cum ascendisset turba cœpit rogare.* Accordingly the Vat. MS. has ἀναβας for ἀναβοησας. Agreeable to which are also the Cop. and Eth. version. The Cam. reads ἀναβας ὁλος, and is followed by the Go. but not by the Sax. which has nothing answering to the first clause, *Cum ascendisset,* but is, in what follows, conformable to the Vul.

12. *What then would ye have me do with him whom ye call king of the Jews?* Τι ουν θελετε ποιησω ὁν λεγετε βασιλεα των Ιουδαιων; Vul *Quid ergo vultis faciam regi Judæorum?* But in this omission the Vul. is singular. There is no Gr. MS. known as yet, which has not ὁν λεγετε: no version, except the Sax. which does not translate it.

25. *Nailed him to the cross,* εσταυρωσαν αυτον. E. T. *Crucified him.* The Eng. verb, *to crucify,* denotes, properly, to put to death by nailing to the cross. The word σταυροω, here, means no more than *to fasten to the cross with nails.* In strict propriety, we should not say a man cried out after he was crucified, but after he was nailed to the cross.

[2] *The third hour.* J. xix. 14. N.

34. *Eloi,* Ελωι. This is the Sy. as well as the Heb. word for *my God.* See J. xx. 17. in the Sy. version. It is there pronounced *Elohi:* but the aspiration must be dropt, when written in Gr. letters, as it suits not the analogy of the Gr. language, to admit it in the middle, or at the end, of a word. For this reason they say *Abraam,* not *Abraham; Judas,* not *Judah.*

42. *When it was evening,* και ηδη οψιας γενομενης. The word answering to *evening* is used with some latitude in Scripture. The Jews spoke of two evenings, Mt. xiv. 23. N. It is probably the former of these that is meant here, and Mt. xxvii. 57. for at six *the preparation ended,* and *the Sabbath* began, when they durst no longer be so employed.

43. *Senator.* Βουλευτης. L. xxiii. 30. N.

44. *Pilate, amazed that he was so soon dead,* ὁ δε Πιλατος εθαυμασεν, ει ηδη τεθνηκε. E. T. *And Pilate marvelled if he were already dead.* Raphelius, with whom agrees bishop Pearce, has shown, by examples from Xenophon and Eusebius, that the conjunction ει is, in some cases, properly translated *that.* We have a strong evidence that this is the meaning here, from the question put to the centurion, *whether Jesus had been dead,* παλαι, *any time,* not ηδη, *already.* That there are two MSS. which read ηδη, is, perhaps, not worth mentioning.

CHAPTER XVI.

2. *About sun-rise,* ανατειλαντος του ηλιου. E. T. *At the rising of the sun.* Vul. *Orto jam sole.* This expresses too much ; for let it be observed, that it is not the preterperfect participle that is here used by the Evangelist, but an aorist. Nor is there a word in the Gr. (except in a very few copies) nor in any other ancient version, answering to *jam* in the La. The E. T. seems in this place, to follow the Cam. which reads ανατελλοντος in the present. But this reading is peculiar to that copy.

8. *Getting out, fled,* εξελθουσαι ταχυ εφυγον. E. T. *Went out quickly, and fled.* But the word ταχυ is wanting in a great number of MSS. some of them of principal note, in several of the best editions, and ancient versions, particularly the Vul. and both the Sy. It is also rejected by Mill and Wet.

16. *He who shall believe,* ὁ πιστευσας. E. T. *He who believeth.* The Gr. aorists have not always the power of the preterite ; but, agreeably to the import of the name, are frequently indefinite in regard to time. Here they are better rendered by the present, as in the E. T. than by the past ; the present, with us, being often used indefinitely. Had the words immediately preceding related to a judgment to come, the most proper sense, here, in Eng. for expressing the Gr. aorist, would have been the future perfect ; that is, a future which is past, in respect of another future referred to. *He who shall have believed, shall be saved.* In this manner all the La. translators, except Ar. have expressed it : *Qui crediderit.* But, as the words immediately preceding are an order to the apostles, with which the words of this passage are connected, as regarding what is necessari-

ly consequent on the execution of that order (for of necessity they would be either believed or disbelieved,) the time is, in our idiom, best expressed by a simple future. Though the future perfect could not be accounted improper, it is so complex [*He who shall have believed, and shall have been baptized,*] that, unless where perspicuity renders it necessary, it is better to avoid it. The later Fr. translators (though that tense be, in their language, a degree simpler than in ours) take this method. P. R. Sa. and Si. though translating from the Vul. and Beau. say *Celui qui croira*, not *qui aura cru.*

[2] *He who shall believe—he who will not believe*, ὁ πιστεύσας —ὁ ἀπιστήσας. E. T. *He that believeth—he that believeth not.* The change of the future from *shall* to *will*, may, to a superficial view, appear capricious; but I imagine the idiom of the language requires this distinction, between a positive and a negative condition. It is accordingly expressed in the same manner in the G. E. A sovereign might properly say to his minister, 'Publish, in my name, this edict to the people; if they shall obey it, they shall be rewarded, but if they will not obey, they shall be punished.' In the former part of the declaration, it is not the will that is required, so much as the performance: in the latter part, a threat is annexed to the non-performance, merely on account of the obstinacy, that is, pravity, of will, by which it is occasioned. This distinction particularly suits the nature of the present case. The belief that results not from evidence, but from an inclination to believe, is not styled *faith*, so properly as *credulity*, which is always accounted an extreme. Nor is that *unbelief*, or even *disbelief*, criminal, that is not justly imputable to a *disinclination*, to believe, in spite of evidence, which is termed *incredulity*, and is as much an extreme as the other. It is required, not that our will operate in producing belief (ample evidence is afforded for this purpose, as mentioned in the two subsequent verses,) but that our will do not operate in a contrary direction, to prevent or obstruct our believing. God alone gives light, he requires of us only that we do not shut our eyes against it. It may be thought an objection to this explanation, that it would imply, that there is a *demerit* in the unbelief that is punishable, at the same time that there is no *merit* in the faith that is to be rewarded. This is doubtless the case. There is no positive *merit* in faith; and if, when compared with infidelity, there may be

ascribed to it a sort of negative merit, the term is evidently used in a sense not strictly proper. But this is no objection to the explanation given above. These contraries do not stand on a footing entirely similar. Death, we know, is the wages of sin; but eternal life, which is the same with salvation, is the gift of God, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

[3] *Shall be condemned*, κατακριθήσεται. E. T. *Shall be damned.* But this is not a just version of the Gr. word. The term *damned*, with us, relates solely to the doom which shall be pronounced upon the wicked at the last day. This cannot be affirmed, with truth, of the Gr. καταχρινω, which corresponds exactly to the Eng. verb. *condemn.* It may relate to that future sentence, and it may not. All the La. translations I know, Vul. Ar. Zu. Er. Cas. Cal. Be. say, *condemnabitur.* But if the word had been *damnabitur*, it would have made no difference, as these two La. verbs are synonymous. It is not so with the Eng. words, *to damn*, and *to condemn.* I cannot help observing, that though the Itn. and Fr. languages have verbs exactly corresponding, in the difference of their meanings, to the two Eng. verbs, their translators have, very properly, preferred the more general term. Dio. says, *Sara condannato :* G. F. L. Cl. Beau. P. R. Si. Sa. *Sara condamné.* In regard to the more modern Eng. versions, they have all replaced the proper word *condemned*, except Wes. who retains the term of the common translation. Ch. xii. 40. N. It is still worse to render the simple verb κρινειν (2 Thess. ii. 12) *to damn ;* that verb properly signifying not so much as *to condemn*, but *to judge*, *to try :* though sometimes used by a figure, the cause for the consequence, to denote *to punish.*

Jerom has observed, that there were few of the Gr. copies, he had seen, which had the last twelve verses of this chapter. They are still wanting in many MSS. and are not comprehended in the canons of Eusebius. But they are in the Sy. version, the Ara. and the Vul. and were in the old Itc. and other ancient versions. They are in the Al. and Cam. MSS. They are, also, in The.'s Commentaries. But what weighs most with me, I acknowledge, is, that the manner wherein so ancient a writer as Irenæus, in the second century, refers to this Gospel, renders it highly probable that the whole passage was read in all the copies known to him. *In fine autem evangelii, ait Marcus, " Et quidem Dominus Jesus, postquam locutus est eis, receptus est in cœlos, et sedet ad dexteram Dei."* Adv. Hær. lib. iii.

cap. 11. The verse quoted is the nineteenth, and the chapter has but twenty. It deserves our notice, that there is not a single MS. which has this verse, that has not, also, the whole passage from the eighth to the end; nor is there a MS. which wants this verse, that does not also want the whole. No authority, of equal antiquity, has yet been produced upon the other side. It has been conjectured, that the difficulty of reconciling the account, here given, of our Lord's appearances, after his resurrection, with those of the other Evangelists, has emboldened some transcribers to omit them. The plausibility of this conjecture, the abruptness of the conclusion of this history, without the words in question, and the want of any thing like a reason for adding them, if they had not been there originally, render their authenticity, at least, probable. Transcribers sometimes presume to add and alter, in order to remove contradictions, but not, as far as I can remember, in order to make them.

NOTES

CRITICAL AND EXPLANATORY.

THE GOSPEL BY LUKE.

CHAPTER I.

1. *Things which have been accomplished amongst us,* των πεπληροφορημενων εν ημιν πραγματων. E. T. *Things which are most surely believed among us.* Vul. *Quæ in nobis completæ sunt rerum.* Lu. So unter uns ergangen sind. Be. *Rerum quarum plena fides nobis facta est.* As the greater part of modern interpreters, who have written since, both abroad and at home, adopt with Be. the latter method of translating, it is proper to assign my reasons for joining Lu. Ham. and the few, who, with the Vul. prefer the former. The verb πληροφορεω admits, in Scripture, two interpretations. One is, *to perform, fulfil,* or *accomplish ;* the other, *to convince, persuade,* or *embolden,* that is, to inspire with that confidence which is commonly consequent upon conviction ; and hence the noun πληροφορια denotes *conviction, assurance, confidence.* The passive πληροφορεομαι is accordingly either *to be performed,* &c. or *to be convinced,* &c. Now, as it is only of things that we can say, *They are performed,* and of persons, *They are convinced,* there can be little doubt in any occurrence, about the signification of the word. But, in the way in which Be. and others have rendered this verse, neither of these senses is given to the term. That they have purposely avoided the first signification, they acknowledge ; nor can it be denied that, aware of the absurdity of speaking of things being *convinced, persuaded,* or *emboldened,* they have eluded the second. For this reason, they have adopted some term nearly related to this meaning, but not coincident with it, or have disguised the deviation by a periphrasis. Our translators have rendered πεπληροφορημενων *most surely believed,* after Er. *quæ certissima*

fidei sunt. But where do we find πληροφορειν signifying *to believe?* Not in Scripture, I suspect: but, that we may not decide rashly, let us examine the places where the word occurs. Paul says, concerning Abraham (Rom. iv. 21.) πληροφορηθεις ὁτι ὁ επηγγελται [ὁ Θεος] δυνατος εστι και ποιησαι, *being convinced that God is able to perform what he hath promised.* Again, in recommending to the Romans moderation and tolerance towards one another, as to days and meats, of which some made distinctions, and others did not, he says (Rom. xiv. 5.), ἑκαστος εν τω ιδιω νοι πληροφορεισθω, *Let every man be convinced in his own mind.* If in such points he act upon conviction, though erroneous, it is enough. As, in both these, it is to persons that this quality is attributed, there has never been any doubt about the meaning. Only we may remark, upon the last example, that it is a direct confutation of what Be. affirms in his notes on L. to be the import of the word, namely, that it implies not the conviction produced, but the full sufficiency of the evidence given. *To* πληροφορεισθαι, says he, *ad res accommodatum, res significat ita certis testimoniis comprobatus, ut de iis ambigi meritò non possit.* Again, *Nec enim hic dictum voluit Lucas fuisse certam ab auditoribus adhibitam Evangelicæ doctrinæ fidem, sed ea sese scripturum de Christi dictis et factis, quæ certissimis testimoniis vera esse constitisset.* Now, in the passage quoted, we find it applied alike to the persuasion of opposite opinions, to wit, that there ought, and that there ought not, to be made a distinction of days and meats. Now, as two contradictory opinions cannot be both true, neither can both be supported by irrefragable evidence. Yet the Apostle says, concerning both, πληροφορεισθω ἑκαστος. The term, therefore, has no relation to the strength or weakness of the evidence; it solely expresses the conviction produced in the mind, whether by real evidence, or by what only appears such. Though both, therefore, deviate, the E. T. deviates less than Be. But to return: there are also in Paul's Epistles two examples of this verb applied to things. He says to Timothy (2 Tim. iv.5.), την διακονιαν σου πληροφορησον, *fulfil thy ministry*, agreeably to the rendering of the Vul. *ministerium tuum imple*, and of all the ancient translations. Be. in conformity to his own explanation of the word *ministerii tui plenam fidem facito*, literally rendered by our interpreters, *make full proof of thy ministry*, as though it were not so much an object to a Christian minister to discharge his duty as to

approve himself to men; whereas, the former is certainly the primary object, the latter but a secondary one at best. This manner is, besides, worse adapted than the other, both to the spirit of Christian morality, which, inspiring with a superiority to the opinions of fallible men, fixes the attention on the unerring judgment of God; and to the simplicity of the apostolical injunctions. The only other passage is in the same chapter (iv. 17.), *Ὁ δε Κυριος μοι παρεστη, και ενεδυναμωσε με, ἱνα δἱ εμου το κηρυγμα πληροφορηθη.* The last clause is rendered by the Vul. *ut per me prædicatio impleatur, that by me the preaching may be accomplished.* Be. after his manner, *ut per me plenè certioraretur præconium*, and after him the E. T. *that by me the preaching might be fully known.* This method has here the additional disadvantage, that it makes the next clause a repetition of the sentiment in other words, and *that all the Gentiles might hear.* Er. has been so sensible of this, that he has deserted his ordinary manner, and said, *ut per me præconium expleretur.* The word occurs only once in the Sep. and, as it is applied to persons, it signifies, *persuaded, emboldened* (Eccl. viii. 11.) *δια τουτο επληροφορηθη καρδια ὑιων του ανθρωπου εν αυτοις του ποιησαι το πονηρον. Therefore the heart of the sons of men is emboldened to do evil.*. It answers in this place to the Heb. מלא *mala*, usually rendered *πληροω.* I shall only add, that the sense here assigned is better suited to the spirit and tenor of these histories than the other. A simple narrative of the facts is given; but no attempt is made, by argument, asseveration, or animated expression, to bias the understanding, or work upon the passions. The naked truth is left to its own native evidence. The writers betray no suspicion of its insufficiency. This method of theirs has more of genuine dignity than the other, and, if I mistake not, has been productive of more durable consequences than ever yet resulted from the arts of rhetoricians, and the enticing words of man's wisdom. The examples from pagan authors will be found to confirm, instead of confuting, the explanation given above. I desire no better instance than the quotation from Ctesias adduced by Wetstein, which appeared to Mr. Parkhurst so satisfactory a support of Beza's interpretation, *Πολλοις ουν λογοις και ὁρκοις πληροφορησαντες Μεγαβυζον*, "Having *convinced* Megabyzus with many words and oaths." In this way rendered, the words are perfectly intelligible, and suit the scope of the writer. But will any one say that Ctesias meant to affirm

that many words and oaths are a full proof of the truth of an opinion ? We all know that they not only are the common resource of those who are conscious that they have no proof or evidence to offer, but with many are more powerful than demonstration itself, in producing conviction.

2. *Afterwards ministers of the word, ὑπηρεται γενομενοι του λογου.* Vul. *Ministri fuerunt sermonis.* I have here also preferred the rendering of the Vul. to that of some modern La. interpreters, who have given a very different sense to the expression. In this I am happy in the concurrence of our translators, who have, in opposition to Be. followed the old interpreter. However, as the authorities on the other side are considerable, it is proper to assign the reasons of this preference. There are three senses which have been put upon the words. First, by *ὁ λογος* some have thought that our our Lord Jesus Christ is meant, who is sometimes so denominated by John. But this opinion is quite improbable, inasmuch as the idiom is peculiar to that Apostle. And even if this were the meaning of the word here, it ought not to be differently translated, because *ministers of the word* is just as much fitted for conveying it in Eng. as *ὑπηρεται του λογου* is in Gr. The Eng. name is neither more seldom nor less plainly given him in the translation, than the Gr. name is given him in the original. If there be any obscurity or ambiguity in the one, there is the same in the other. The second meaning is that which most modern interpreters have adopted, who render *του λογου the thing*, not *the word;* supposing it to denote the same with *πραγματων* in the preceding verse ; and understand by *υπηρεται* those concerned in the events, either as subordinate agents in effecting them, or as partakers in their immediate consequences. Thus Be. *administri ipsius rei* ; Cas. to the same purpose, *administratores rei ;* Er. followed by the interpreter of Zu. more in the style of Virgil than of Luke, *qui pars aliqua eorum fuerant* ; and these have had their imitators among the translators into modern languages. Now my reasons for not adopting this manner, which is supported by expositors of great name, are the following : 1st, If *λογος* had meant here (as I acknowledge it often does *thing*,) not *word*, it would have been in the plural number, as *πραγματων* is, which relates to the same events, things so multifarious as

to include whatever Jesus did, or said, or suffered. 2dly, When the word λογος, in the fourth verse, is actually used in this meaning, having the same reference as πραγμα to the things accomplished, it is in the plural. Λογος, therefore, in the singular in this acceptation in the second verse, would not be more repugnant to propriety than to the construction both of the preceding part of the sentence and of the following. 3dly, I am as little satisfied as to the propriety of the word ὑπηρεται in that interpretation. Ὑπηρετης denotes properly *minister*, *servant*, or *agent*, employed by another in the performance of any work. But in what sense the Apostles or other disciples could be called *ministers* or *agents* in the much greater part of those events, whereof the Gospel gives us a detail, I have no conception. The principal things are what happened to our Lord, his miraculous conception and divine original, the manifest interposition of the Deity at his baptism and transfiguration, also his trial, death, resurrection, and ascension. In these surely they had no agency or ministry whatever. As to the miracles which he performed, and the discourses which he spoke; the most that can be said of the Apostles, is, that they saw the one, and heard the other. Nor could any little service in ordinary matters, such as distributing the loaves and fishes to the multitude, making preparation for the passover, or even the extraordinary powers by which they were enabled to perform some miracles, not recorded in the Gospels, entitle them to be styled ὑπηρεται των πεπληροφορημενων εν ἡμιν πραγματων, of which alone the Gospels are the histories; and for expressing their participation in the immediate effects of what they witnessed, the term ὑπηρεται appears to me quite unsuitable. So much for the rejection of that interpretation, though favoured by Gro. and Ham. My reasons for adopting the other are these: *The word of God*, ὁ λογος του Θεου, was, with Jews as well as Christians, a common expression for whatever God communicates to men for their instruction, whether doctrines or precepts. Thus our Lord, in explaining the parable of the sower, informs us that the seed denotes *the word of God*, ὁ λογος του Θεου (L. viii. 11.). In what follows in the explanation, and in the other Gospels, it is styled simply *the word*. Thus (Mr. iv. 14.), Ὁ σπειρων τον λογον σπειρει, *The sower*, which is explained to mean the preacher, *soweth the word*. Hence, among Christians, it came frequently to denote the Gospel, the last, and the best, revelation of God's will to men. Nor is this

idiom more familiar to any of the sacred writers than to L. See the following passages; L. viii. 12, 13. 15. Acts, iv. 4. vi. 4. viii. 4. x. 44. xi. 19. xiv. 25. xvi. 6. xvii. 11. For brevity's sake, I have produced those places only wherein the abridged form, *ὁ λογος*, *the word*, is used as in the text. I cannot help observing that in one of the passages above quoted, Acts, vi. 4. the phrase is *ἡ διακονια του λογου*, *the ministry of the word*. This is mentioned as being eminently the business of the Apostles, and opposed to *διακονια τραπεξων*, *the service of tables*, an inferior sort of ministry, which was soon to be committed to a set of stewards elected for the purpose. Who knows not that *ὑπηρετης* and *διακονος* are, for the most part, in the Acts and Epistles, used indiscriminately for a minister of religion? It is impossible, therefore, on reflection, to hesitate a moment in affirming, that the historian here meant to acquaint us, that he had received his information from those who had attended Jesus, and been witnesses of every thing during his public ministration upon the earth, and who, after his ascension, had been intrusted by him with the charge of propagating his doctrine throughout the world. *Auditors* first, *ministers* afterwards.

3. *Having exactly traced every thing*, *παρηκολουθηκοτι πασιν ακριβως*. E. T. *Having had perfect understanding of all things*. The words in the original express more than is comprised in the common version. By the active verb *παρακολουθεω*, joined with the adverb *ακριβως*, are suggested his diligence and attention in procuring exact information, and not barely the effect, or that he actually possessed an accurate account of the whole. I agree with Maldonat, who says, "Non scientiam his verbis, sed diligentiam suam commendat, quam in quærendis, vestigandis, explorandisque iis rebus adhibuerit quas scribere volebat." The interpretation here given is also, in my judgment, more conformable to the import of the verb *παρακολουθεω* in other passages of the N. T. where it is spoken of persons. 1 Tim. iv. 6. 2 Tim. iii. 10. That L. was not, as Whitby supposes, an attendant on our Lord's ministry, the contrast, in the preceding verse, of *αυτοπται και ὑπηρεται*, *eye-witnesses and ministers*, to what he calls, in this verse, *παρηκολουθηκως πασιν ακριβως*, clearly shows. Can we imagine that, by this less explicit phrase, he would have described the source of his own intelligence, had he been himself of the *αυτοπται και ὑπηρεται*.

There is, besides, in the preceding words, another contrast of the *αυτοπται* who gave the first testimony concerning Jesus, to those who received their testimony, in which latter class he includes himself, *παρεδοσαν ΗΜΙΝ οι απ' αρχης αυτοπται*. Now, if it had not been his express purpose to rank himself among these; if he had meant to oppose the *αυτοπται* to those only who, from their information, had formerly undertaken narratives, the proper and obvious expression would have been, *καθως παρεδοσαν ΑΥΤΟΙΣ οι απ' αρχης αυτοπται*.

[2] *To write a particular account to thee*, *καθεξης σοι γραψαι* E. T. *To write unto thee in order*. From the word *καθεξης* we cannot conclude, as some have hastily done, that the order of time is observed better by this, than by any other, Evangelist. The word *καθεξης* does not necessarily relate to time. See Acts xviii. 23. The proper import of it is *distinctly, particularly*, as opposed to *confusedly, generally*.

[3] *Theophilus*, *Θεοφιλε*. It has been questioned whether this word is to be understood here as a proper name, or as an appellative. In the latter case, it ought to be rendered *lover of God*. But I prefer the former, which is the more usual, way of understanding it. For, 1st, If the Evangelist meant to address his discourse to all pious Christians, and had no one individual in view, I think he would have put his intention beyond all doubt, by using the plural number, and saying *κρατιστοι Θεοφιλοι*. 2dly, This enigmatical manner of addressing all true Christians, under the appearance of bespeaking the attention of an individual, does not seem agreeable to the simplicity of style used in the Gospel, and must have appeared to the writer himself as what could not fail to be misunderstood by most readers, proper names of such a form as Theophilus, and even this very name, being common in Gr. and La. authors. 3dly, In the Scriptures, when *φιλος*, that is, *lover*, or *friend*, makes part of a compound epithet, it is always, if I mistake not, placed in the beginning, not the end, of the compound. The Apostle Paul, to express *lover of God*, says, *φιλοθεος* (2 Tim. iii. 4). There occur, also, in holy writ, several other compositions, after the same manner, of which this noun makes a part; as, *φιλαγαθος*, *φιλαδελφος*, *φιλανδρος*, *φιλανθρωπος*, *φιλαργυρος*, *φιλαυτος*, *φιληδονος*, *φιλοικος*, *φιλοξενος*, *φιλοσοφος*, *φιλοστοργος*, *φιλοτεκνος*. The other manner wherein *φιλος* is placed in the end, though not unexampled in clas-

sical writers, is much more uncommon. Lastly, What is said in the fourth verse evidently shows, that the author addressed himself to a person, with whose manner of being instructed in the Christian doctrine he was particularly acquainted.

* *Most excellent*, κρατιστε. Some consider this as an epithet, denoting the character of the person named, others as an honorary title, expressing respect to office or rank. I prefer the latter opinion. The word occurs only in three other places of the N. T. all in the acts of the Apostles, another work of the same hand. In these places, the title is manifestly given as a mark of respect to eminence of station. Accordingly it is only on Felix and Festus, when they were governors of the province, that we find it conferred. It is therefore not improbable that Theophilus has been the chief magistrate of some city of note in Greece or Asia Minor, and consequently intitled to be addressed in this respectful manner. For though Paul observes (1 Cor. i. 26.), that there were not many wise men after the flesh, not many rich, not many noble, in the Christian community, his expression plainly suggests that there were some. And, at the same time that we find the inspired penmen ready to show all due respect to magistracy, and to give honour, as well tribute, to whom it is due; no writers are less chargeable with giving flattering titles to men. Such compellations, therefore, as αγαθε, βελτιστε, κρατιστε, when they may be considered as adulatory or complimental, however usual among the Greeks, do not suit the manner of the sacred writers. When Paul gave this title to Festus, it appears it was customary so to address the Roman presidents or procurators. In this manner we find Felix, who preceded Festus, was addressed, both by the military tribune Lysias, and by the orator Tertullus. Such titles are a mere piece of deference to the civil establishment, and imply dignity of function or rank, but no personal quality in the man to whom they are given. The same distinction, between official respect and personal, obtains amongst ourselves. Among so many *reverends*, it is, no doubt, possible to find some whose private character would entitle them to no *reverence*. And it will not, perhaps, be thought miraculous to meet with an *honourable*, on whom the principles of *honour* and honesty have little influence. The order of civil society requires a certain deference to office and rank, independently of the merit of the occupant, and a

proper attention in paying this deference, shows regard to the constitution of the country, and is of public utility, in more respects than one. But of those commendatory epithets, which are merely personal, these writers, alike untainted with fanaticism and flattery, are very sparing. They well knew, that where they are most merited, they are least coveted, or even needed. But, in a few ages afterwards, the face of things, in this respect, changed greatly. In proportion as men became more deficient in valuable qualities, they became more fond, and more lavish of fine words.

5. *Of the course of Abijah*, εξ εφημεριας Αβια. This was one of the twenty-four sacerdotal families into which the whole order was divided by David (1 Chron. xxiv. 3, &c.) and which served in the temple by turns.

9. *The sanctuary*, τον ναον. E. T. *The temple.* Had the word been το ιερον, it could not have been rendered otherwise than *the temple;* but ὁ ναος, though commonly translated the same way, is not synonymous. The former comprehended the whole edifice, with all its enclosures, piazzas, and other buildings; the latter included only what was termed, by way of eminence, the house, consisting of the vestibule, the holy place or sanctuary, and the most holy. The altar of incense, on which the perfumes were burnt, was in the sanctuary: the people who were praying without, were in the temple, εν τω ιερω, in the court of Israel, though not in what was strictly called the house of God, that is, εν τω ναω. In order to render the version as explicit as the original, it behoves us to avoid confounding things in the one, which are not confounded in the other.

15. *Any fermented liquor*, σικερα. E. T. *Strong drink.* Some think that by this name was meant a liquor made of dates, the fruit of the palm tree, a drink much used in the East. But I see no reason for confining the term to this signification. The word is Heb. שכר *shecher*, and has been retained by the Seventy interpreters in those passages where the law of the Nazarites is laid down, and in the rules to be observed by the priests, when it should be their turn to officiate in the temple. The Heb. root signifies *to ineberate*, or *make drunk.* All fermented liquors, therefore, as being capable of producing this effect, were understood as implied in the term. *Strong drink* is not the meaning. It might be impossible by words to define intelligibly the precise degree of strength forbidden, or for

judges to ascertain the transgression. For this reason the proper subject of positive law is kinds, not degrees in quality, whereof no standard can be assigned. For this reason, all liquors, however weak, which had undergone fermentation, were understood to be prohibited both to the Nazarites, and to the priests during the week wherein they officiated in the temple.

17. *And, by the wisdom of the righteous, to render the disobedient a people well-disposed for the Lord,* και απειθεις, εν φρονησει δικαιων, ετοιμασαι Κυριω λαον κατεσκευασμενον. E. T. *And the disobedient to the wisdom of the just, to make ready a people prepared for the Lord.* The construction, in this way of rendering the words, must be και επιστρεψαι απειδεις εν φρονησει δικαιων, ετοιμασαι λαον κατεσκευασμενον Κυριω. I readily admit that εν in the N. T. is sometimes used, according to the Heb. idiom for εις or επι, and sometimes for συν or for δια; but this concession is not to be understood as implying, that such a use may happen equally in whatever way the words be connected. I question whether the verb επιστρεψαι will ever be found joined with the preposition εν, for expressing to turn to, or to convert to. It renders it the more improbable that this should be the case here, as in the preceding clause we find the verb επιστρεψαι followed by the preposition επι, for expressing this very idea, *turning to*, or *converting to*. That in two parallel and similar clauses, depending on the same verb, such an alteration should be made in the construction, is very improbable, being repugnant at once to simplicity, perspicuity, and propriety. It has some weight also, that as, in that explanation, the sentence has three clauses, though the first and the second are coupled by the conjunction και, there is no copulative prefixed to the third. This, at least, is unusual, and suits neither the Heb. idiom nor the Gr. In the way I understand the sentence, it has but two clauses. Απειθεις is not governed by επιστρεψαι, but by the following verb ετοιμασαι. The placing of a comma after απειθεις is all the change necessary in the pointing. This makes εν φρονησει δικαιων fall between two commas, and express the manner in which the Baptist was to effect those changes, namely, by inculcating that disposition of mind which, with righteous men, is the only genuine wisdom or prudence. Bishop Pearce has given the same turn to the sentence; only he seems to think that the word δικαιων peculiarly relates to John

himself. This supposition is quite unnecessary, and, as the word is in the plural number, embarrasses the construction. The wisdom of the righteous may well be understood as opposed to the wisdom of the ungodly, in like manner as the wisdom which is from above (another phrase for the same thing) is opposed to the wisdom which is from beneath.

23. *His days of officiating:* that is, his week (for it lasted no longer at one turn,) during which time he was not permitted to leave the precincts of the temple, or to have any intercourse with his wife.

28. *Favourite of Heaven, κεχαριτωμενη.* Vul. *Gratia plena.* There is no doubt that, in the sense wherein this last expression was used by Jerom, it was of the same import with that given here, after Dod. and with that used in the E. T. *thou art highly favoured.* But at present, the phrase *full of grace* would not convey the same meaning. Be. *Gratis dilecta.* This, though in strictness (if we consider only the import of the words taken severally) it may be defended, conveys an insinuation exceedingly improper and unjust. *Gratis dilecta* is precisely such a compellation as we should reckon suitable, had it been given to the woman whom our Lord permitted to anoint his feet in the house of Simon, to the great scandal of that Pharisee, who knew her former life. What might even but obliquely suggest a conception so remote from the scope of the Evangelist, ought carefully to be avoided.

[2] *The Lord be with thee, ὁ Κυριος μετα σου.* E. T. *The Lord is with thee.* Vul. Er. and Zu. *Dominus tecum.* Be. *Dominus tecum est.* As the substantive verb is not expressed in the original, it may be interpreted either in the indicative or in the optative. When rendered as an affirmation, we cannot question its truth. But it seems more suitable to the form of salutation, which is always expressive of good wishes, to understand it in the latter of these ways. The word *χαιρε,* which immediately precedes, suits this interpretation, and so did all the forms of saluting customary among the Hebrews, such as, *Peace be to this house; the Lord be with you: and, the Lord bless you.* See ch. x. 5. Ruth. ii. 4.

[3] *Thou happiest of women, ευλογημενη συ εν γυναιξιν.* E. T. *Blessed art thou among women.* I conceive this expression here

as more properly a compellation than either an affirmation or a salutation ; and I understand the pronoun as emphatical, and in the vocative. Such a phrase as *ευλογημενη εν γυναιξιν* is, in the Heb. idoim, an expression of the superlative. It is accordingly so rendered by Cas. in this place, *mulierum fortunatissima.* The same idiom is sometimes similarly used in the E. T. Thus, *ἡ καλη εν γυναιξιν* in the Sep. which is literally from the Heb. is, with us, *thou fairest among women*, Cant. i. 8. and בבהמה גבור ליש *laish gibbor babbehemah, a lion, which is strongest among beasts*, Prov. xxx. 30. The expression used here by the Evangelist we find repeated, v 42. ; but as it is coupled with another clause, *και ευλογημενος ὁ καρπος της κοιλιας σου* it must there be understood as an affirmation.

29. *At his appearance and words she was perplexed, ἡ δε ιδουσα, διεταραχθη επι τω λογω αυτου.* Vul. *Quæ cum audisset, turbata est in sermone ejus.* This version would appear to have sprung from a different reading ; yet there is no known reading that is entirely conformable to it. The Cam. and two other MSS. omit *ιδουσα.* Si. thinks that the Vul. fully expresses the meaning of the original, and that the Evangelist, in saying *ιδουσα*, has, by a trope not unusual with the sacred authors, expressed the operation of one of our senses by a term which, in strictness, belongs to another. I admit, that there are examples of this kind, but I see no occasion for recurring to them here. It cannot be questioned that such an extraordinary appearance, as well as the words spoken, would contribute to affect the mind of the Virgin with apprehension and fear.

35. *The holy progeny, το γεννωμενον ἁγιον.* E. T. *That holy thing which shall be born of thee.* Vul. *Quod nascetur ex te sanctum.* This is one of the few instances in which our translators have deserted the common Gr. and preferred the present reading of the Vul. There are indeed four MSS. only one of them of note, and the first Sy. with some other versions, which concur with the Vul. in reading *εκ σου* after *το γεννωμενον.* But though this is the reading of the authorised editions of the Vul. it is not the reading of most MS. copies. Some of the Fathers read these words in some MSS. and attempted to account for the omission of them, in the much greater number, by imputing it to the Eutychians and other

heretics, who (they would have us believe) expunged them, because unfavourable to their errors. But it is far more probable that the orthodox, or ruling party, who were as chargeable with frauds of this sort as any heretics, should have had it in their power to foist the words in question into four or five copies, which are all as yet found to have them, than that any sectaries should have had it in their power to expunge them out of more than fifty times that number, in which they are wanting. As the sense is complete without them, the greater number of copies, especially where the difference in number is so considerable, ought to determine the point. Wet. suspects, and not implausibly, that the inserted words have been transferred hither from Gal. iv. 4. As there is nothing in the words themselves that is not strictly conformable to truth, it is easy to assign a reason why some modern editors, and even translators, have thought it more eligible to insert than to omit them. In such cases, this will be found the most common way of deciding.

37. *Nothing is impossible with God,* ουκ αδυνατησει παρα τω Θεω παν ρημα. Vul. *Non erit impossibile apud Deum omne verbum.* Diss. IX. P. II. § 9.

45. *Happy is she who believed,* μακαρια ἡ πιστευσασα. Vul. *Beata quæ credidisti.* In like manner Cas. *Beatam te quæ credideris.* A little after, in the same verse, both have *tibi*, where in the original it is αυτῃ. Agreeable to these is the Sax. This expression of the sentiment, by the second person instead of the third, seems peculiar to these translators, but does not affect the sense.

[2] *That the things which the Lord hath promised her shall be performed,* ὁτι εσται τελειωσις τοις λελαλημενοις αυτῃ παρα Κυριου. E. T. *For there shall be a performance of those things, which were told her from the Lord.* Vul. *Quoniam perficientur ea quæ dicta sunt tibi a Domino.* To the same purpose Be. *Nam consummabuntur ea quæ dicta sunt ei a Domino.* Cas. differently, *Perfectum iri quæ tibi a Domino significata sunt.* The instances in the N. T. wherein ὁτι does not signify *because*, but *that*, are very many. The. understands it so in this place. So also does Gro. and some other expositors of name. It must, at the same time, be acknowledged, that the words are susceptible of either interpretation. The reasons which have induced me to prefer the latter are the fol-

lowing. After πιστευω, when a clause is subjoined representing the thing believed, it is invariably introduced by ὁτι, which in those cases cannot be rendered otherwise than *that*. See Mt. ix. 28. Mr. xi. 23, 24. J. xi. 27. 42. xiii. 19. xiv. 10, 11. xvi. 27. 30. xvii. 8. 21. xx. 31. I have, for the sake of brevity, referred only to examples which occur in the Gospels. 2dly, The person or subject believed is always subjoined, unless there be something in the preceding words which show clearly what it is. Now there is nothing here in the preceding words which can suggest what was believed. It is then highly probable, that it is contained in the words succeeding. 3dly, That this clause expresses, not the reward of belief, but the thing believed, is probable from this consideration, that Elizabeth had doubtless in view the superiority of Mary, above her own husband Zacharias, inasmuch as the former readily believed the heavenly messenger, which the latter did not. Now, if Elizabeth meant to point out the superior felicity of Mary, on account of her faith, she would never have specified a circumstance which happened equally to her who believed, and to him who did not believe; for to both there was a performance of those things which had been told them from the Lord. It would have been rather inopportune to mention this circumstance as the special reward of her faith, though very apposite to subjoin it as the subject.

[3] Some have thought that the words παρα Κυριου, in the end, are better connected with τελειωτις, and that, therefore, τοις λελαλημενοις αυτη should be included between commas. When the effect is equal in respect of the sense, the simplest manner of construing the sentence ought to be preferred. Admitting then, that παδα Κυριου may be properly conjoined either with τελειωτις, or with λελαλημενοις αυτη, it is preferable to adopt the construction which suits the order of the words, where there is no special reason for deserting that order. The phrase, *things spoken* or *promised to her*, does not necessarily imply that it was the Lord who spoke them, even though he be mentioned as the author of the events; but, in speaking of the performance of things promised by the Lord, it is manifestly implied, that the Lord hath performed them. A promise is performed only by the promiser. This is, therefore, better, as it is a fuller expression of what is admitted on all sides to be the meaning. One would almost think of some critics, that they dislike an exposi-

tion, because it is obvious, and prefer one palpably worse, which requires some transposition of the words. To transpose the words is sometimes necessary in explaining these writings, but the presumption is always against the transposition, when the words, as they lie, yield as good and as pertinent a meaning.

49. *Whose name is venerable, και αγιον το ονομα αυτου.* Diss. VI. P. IV. § 9, &c.

51. *Dispelleth the vain imaginations of the proud, διεσκορπισεν υπερηφανους διανοια καρδιας αυτων.* E. T. *He hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts.* Gro. justly observes that this is a figurative manner of expressing, *He scattereth the proud, as to what concerns the thoughts of their hearts;* that is, *their vain imaginations.* "Dissipavit superbos quod consilia cordis ipsorum attinet." Maldonat says, to the same purpose, "Dispersit superbos mente cordis sui, *pro* dispersit cogitationes cordis superborum, id est, ipsorum consilia et machinationes." With the Hellenist Jews it is not unusual in such canticles to express general truths or observations, which have no relation to any particular time, by the aorist. See the song of Hannah, 1 Sam. ii. 1, &c. in the Sep. version, which bears a resemblance to this of Mary. I have, in this version employed the present, as better suited to the genius of our language.

54, 55. *He supported Israel his servant (as he promised to our fathers,) ever inclined to mercy towards Abraham and his race, αντελαβετο Ισραελ παιδος αυτου, μνησθηναι ελεους (καθως ελαλησε προς τους πατερας ημων) τω Αβρααμ και τω σπερματι αυτου εις τον αιωνα.* E. T. *He hath holpen his servant Israel, in remembrance of his mercy; as he spake to our fathers, to Abraham, and to his seed for ever.* There can hardly be a reasonable doubt that there is, in this passage, an infringement of the natural order. Such a construction as *ελαλησε προς τους πατερας, τω Αβρααμ,* is, to the best of my remembrance, unexampled in these writings. All the correction in the pointing necessary in Gr. for avoiding this singular construction, is very simple. If we include *καθως ελαλησε προς τους πατερας ημων* in a parenthesis, the apparent solecism is totally removed. But the irregular syntax in the sentence, as commonly read, which has often been remarked by the critics, is not the only objection to it. The expression is not agreeable to the style of Scripture on those subjects. In relation to the promises, God is very often said, in general, to have spoken to the fathers, or, in par-

ticular, to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob ; but never to Abraham and his posterity. That those promises concern the posterity is plain, and is often mentioned : but it is nowhere said that they were spoken to them. The very addition of the words *for ever*, *εις τον αιωνα*, shows the same thing, to wit, that their connexion is not with *ελαλησε*, but with *μνησθηναι ελεους*. Some editors, sensible of this, though not sensible of the irregularity of the construction, as the passage is commonly interpreted, or of the impropriety of the expression now taken notice of, have included all between *ελεους* and *εις τον αιωνα* in a parenthesis. These, by their manner of departing from the order of the words in the explanation they give of them, make a still greater stretch, and a longer suspension of the sense, to less purpose.

[2] *To remember mercy* is not an unfrequent Oriental idiom, for expressing to incline to mercy, to be merciful. See Ps. xcviii 3. cix. 16. Hab. iii. 2.

64. *And his mouth was opened directly, and his tongue loosed*, *ανεωχθη δε το στομα παραχρημα και ἡ γλωσσα αυτου*. In adding the word *loosed*, I have followed the common translation. The genius of modern tongues does not always permit the freedom used by the ancients. But it sometimes happens that, in attempting to escape one difficulty, a person runs, before he is aware, into a greater. Elsner was so struck with the incongruity (as it appeared to him)of the application of *ανεωχθη* to *γλωσσα*, that, in order to avoid it, he has attempted to construe the sentence in a quite different manner, making one clause to end with the word *παραχρημα*, and making the noun *γλωσσα* the nominative to the following verb *ελαλει*. The subsequent member of the sentence, according to him stands thus, *και ἡ γλωσσα αυτου και ελαλει ευλογων τον Θεον*. Passing the objections to which the form of the expression is liable (for the examples he produces, in support of his hypothesis, are far from being similar,) it is strange that a man of his knowledge and discernment did not discover that *γλωσσα ευλογων* was incomparably more exceptionable than the expression against which he objected. Raphelius and others have given the most convincing evidence, that such idioms as a verb joined to two nouns, related in meaning to each other, to one of which alone the verb is strictly applicable, are warranted by the most approved classical authority in prose and verse.

The *σιτον και οινον εδοντες* of Homer is well known. Nor does that of the Apostle greatly differ. *Γαλα ὑμας εποτισα και ου βρωμα*, which is literally in Eng. *I made you drink milk and not meat*, 1 Cor. iii. 2. This sounds rather more harshly to us than the literal version of the text under examination. *Then were opened his mouth and his tongue.* But we see that even critics, sometimes, rather than acknowledge in the sacred penmen a negligence of expression, not without example in the best writers, will find it necessary to admit a blunder hardly to be met with in the worst.

67. *Prophesied*, *προεφητευσε*. I have retained the word; though, in the Jewish idiom, *to prophesy* admits of several senses, Amongst others, it often means to express the devout sentiments to which a particular occurrence gives rise, in such a song of praise as that which he has subjoined. It must be owned, however, that, in this canticle, there are some things which, in strict propriety, are prophetical, according to the acceptation of the term *prophecy*, in our language. This is an additional reason for retaining the word in this place.

69, 70, 71. *And (as anciently he promised by his holy Prophets) hath raised a Prince for our deliverance, in the house of David his servant; for our deliverance from our enemies, and from the hands of all who hate us—και εγειρε κερας σωτηριας ἡμιν εν τω οικω Δαβιδ του παιδος αυτου· καθως ελαληδε δια στοματος των αγιων των απ' αιωνος προφητων αυτου, σωτηριαν εξ εχθρων ἡμων και εκ χειρος παντων των μισουντων ἡμας.* E. T. *And he hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David; as he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began: that we should be saved from our enmies, and from the hand of all that hate us.* All such Scripture songs, as that from which these words are taken, are expressed in the Oriental poetic idiom, resembling that of the Psalms. Now, it is impossible to render these into another language, with tolerable clearness and propriety, without using greater latitude of expression than is necessary in translating plain prose. For this reason, I have taken the freedom to make here a small alteration in the arrangement. The 70th verse is a parenthesis; and, that the interruption which it gives to the meaning may, as little as possible, hurt perspicuity, I have introduced it immediately after *and*, in the beginning

of v. 69. In consequence of this transposition, the verb *εγειρε* is more closely connected with its regimen *σωτηριαν*. I have also preferred the proper term, to the trope, in the translation of *κερας*. *Horn of salvation*, is both too obscure, and too little suited to our mode of speaking, to be fit for admission into modern languages. When there can be no doubt about the meaning, a translator ought not anxiously to trace figures which do not suit the language he is writing. Often a metaphor, which has energy, and even elegance, in one tongue, is both dark and uncouth in another. For the greater clearness, I have also rendered *ελαλησε, promised*, a sense which it often has in the prophetic writings.

75. *In piety and uprightness*, *εν οσιοτητι και δικαιοσυνη ενωπιον αυτου*. The two last words *ενωπιον αυτου*, *before him*, that is, God, are a common Hebraism, to denote that the virtues mentioned are genuine, as under the eye of God.

78. *Who hath caused a light to spring from on high to visit us*, *εν οις επεσκεψατο ημας ανατολη εξ υψους*, E. T. *Whereby the day-spring from on high hath visited us. The day-spring* is an expression rather indefinite. If it mean *the dawn*, it is too faint an image for the subject. It has been observed by critics, that *ανατολη* is the word used by the Sep. in rendering the Heb. צמח *tsemoch*, which signifies *a branch*, or a young shoot, a name by which the Messiah appears to have been denominated by some of the Prophets. The word *ανατολη* is also used sometimes to denote *the sun-rising ;* lastly, it signifies the East, or the quarter of the heavens in which he rises. That it does not, in this place, answer to *branch*, the reason urged by Gro. Ham. and other commentators, is sufficient evidence. It is not natural to speak of sending a branch, to enlighten those who are in darkness, or to direct their feet in the way. If the sun, as he appears in rising, had been here alluded to, *ανατολη* would not have been without the article. Besides, it is so far justly argued, by Wet. that the rising sun cannot be here understood by *ανατολη*, because the sun, when he rises, is always in the horizon ; whereas this light is spoken of as coming from on high, *εξ υψους*, and must, therefore, be rather vertical than horizontal. Now, the word *ανατολη*, imports not only *oriens*, but *ortus ;* and is alike applicable to any light newly sprung up, or appearing. This sense of the word I have adopted here, and endeavoured to express with perspicuity.

CHAPTER II.

1. *All the inhabitants of the empire, τασαν την οικουμενην.* E. T. *All the world.* Vul. *Universus orbis. Οικουμενη* means, strictly, the inhabited part of the earth, and therefore, *πασα ἡ οικουμενη, all the world*, in the common acceptation of the phrase. But it is well known, that this expression was, in ancient times, frequently employed to denote *the Roman empire.* It has, probably, been a title first assumed by the Romans, through arrogance, afterwards given by others, through flattery, and at last appropriated, by general use, to this signification. That it has a more extensive meaning, in this place, is not, I think, pretended by any. But there are some who, on the contrary, would confine it still further, making it denote no more than Judea and its appendages, or all that was under the dominion of Herod. Of this opinion are several of the learned, Binæus, Beau. Dod. Lardner, Pearce, and others. In support of it, they have produced some passages, in which this phrase, or expressions equivalent, appear to have no larger signification. Admitting their explanation of the passages they produce, they are not parallel to the example in hand. Such hyperboles are indeed current, not only in the language of the Evangelists, but in every language. In those cases, however, wherein they are introduced, there rarely fails to be something, either in what is spoken, or in the occasion of speaking, which serves to explain the trope. For example; the term, *a country*, in English, denotes, properly a region or tract of land inhabited by a people living under the same government, and having the same laws. By this, which is the common acceptation, we should say that England is *a country.* Yet the term is often used without any ambiguity, in a more limited sense. Thus, to adopt a familiar illustration: An inhabitant of a country town, or parish, says to one of his neighbours, speaking of a young man and a young woman of their acquaintance, "All the country says that they are soon to be married;" yet so far is he from meaning, by the phrase, *all the country*, all the people of England, that he is sensible that not a thousandth part of them knows that such persons exist. He means no more than *all the village*, or *all the neighbourhood.* Nor is he in the smallest danger in speaking thus.

of being misunderstood by any hearer. Every body perceives that, in such cases, the phrase has a greater or less extent of meaning, according to the sphere of the persons spoken of. But if, on the other hand, he should say, "The parliament has laid a tax on saddle-horses throughout all the country;" nobody could imagine that less than England were intended by the term *country*, in this application. Here the term must be considered as it stands related to parliament; in other words, it must be that which, in the style of the legislature, would be named *the country*. In like manner, though it might not be extraordinary that a Jew, addressing himself to Jews, and speaking of their own people only, should employ such a hyperbolé as *all the world*, for all Judea, it would be exceedingly unnatural in him, and, therefore, highly improbable that he should use the same terms, applied in the same manner, in relating the resolves and decrees of the Roman emperor, to whom all Judea would be very far from appearing all the world, or even a considerable part of it. In reporting the orders given by another, especially a sovereign, the reporter is presumed to convey the ideas, and even, as nearly as possible, the words, of the person or sovereign of whom he speaks. Some have, not improbably, supposed, for it is in the manner of exact narrators, that the words *απογραφεσθαι την οικουμενην*, were the words of the emperor's edict, and copied thence by the Evangelist. I shall only add, that the Sy. interpreter, as all the other ancient interpreters, understood the words in the same manner, כלה צמא ראוהרנה *all the people of his* (the emperor's) *dominions*. I am not insensible, that this opinion is liable to objections, from the silence of historians and the improbability of the thing: and though these objections do not appear to me so formidable, as they do to some others, the examination of them, severally, would lead into a length of discussion but ill suited to my design. I shall, therefore, only add, in general, that, for my own part, I should have less scruple in admitting that, about a point of this kind, the extent of the emperor's edict (which nowise affects the faith of a Christian,) the writer might have mistaken, or been misinformed, than in giving such forced meanings, and unnatural construction, to his words, as tend but too manifestly to unsettle all language, and render every thing in words ambiguous and doubtful. May not that be here called *an edict*,

which was no more than *a declared purpose*, a purpose too not to be executed at once, but gradually, as circumstances would permit ?

[1] *Should be registered, απογραφεσθαι.* E. T. *Should be taxed.* Vul. and Be. *Describeretur.* Er. Zu. and Cas. *Censeretur.* Our translators have, in this instance, not so properly, in my opinion, preferred the three last. *Απογραφεσθαι* is, strictly, *to be registered*, or *enrolled ; αποτιμασθαι, to be taxed.* Almost all the modern translations I have seen, into Itn. Fr. or Eng. have adopted the former interpretation. As *the register* was commonly made with a view to *taxing ;* it may, no doubt, in many cases, be, with sufficient propriety, rendered in the manner our translators, and others, have done. However, as, in this place, there is some difficulty, it is better to adhere strictly to the import of the words. Though it was commonly for the purpose of taxing that a register was made, it was not always, or necessarily so. In the present case, we have ground to believe, that there was no immediate view to taxation, at least with respect to Judea. Herod (called the great) was then alive, and king of the country, and though in subordination to the Romans, of whom he may justly be said to have held his crown ; yet, as they allowed him all the honours of royalty, there is no ground to think that either, in his life-time, or, before the banishment of his son Archelaus, the Romans would directly, by their own officers, levy any toll or tribute from the people of Judea. Nay, we have the testimony of the Jewish historian Josephus, that they did not till after the expulsion of Archelaus, when the country was annexed to Syria, and so became part of a Romance province. But it may appear an objection to this account, that it should be considered in an imperial edict as a part, in any respect, of the Roman empire ; and that one should be sent, by the emperor, into the country, to make an enrollment of the people. To this I answer, that as to the name *οικουμενη*, though it has been shown, that it was commonly employed to denote the Roman empire, we ought not to interpret the name *empire* too rigidly, as confined to the provinces under the immediate dominion of Rome. It may well be understood to comprehend all the countries tributary to, or dependent on Rome. Now, there is one important purpose that such registers, even where no tax was imposed, were well fitted to answer ; they enabled those haughty lords of the world to know the state of their dependencies, and to

form a judgment both as to the sums of money which might be reasonably exacted from their respective princes, and as to the number of soldiers which might be obtained in case of war. Nor is it at all improbable, that when a census was making of the empire, properly so called, the enrollment of the families might be extended to Judea, with a view to the exaction of an oath of fidelity, as Wet. supposes, founding his opinion on a passage of Josephus, and with no design of taxing the country then. Yet the register taken at that time, might be afterwards used by the Romans, for assisting them in levying a tax.

2. *This first register took effect when Cyrenius was president of Syria,* αὐτη ἡ απογραφη πρωτη εγενετο, ἡγεμονευοντος της Συριας Κυρηνιου. E. T. *And this taxing was first made, when Cyrenius was governor of Syria.* Vul. *Hæc descriptio prima facta est a præside Syriæ Cyrino.* About the import of this verse, there is a great diversity of opinions among the critics. Yet, when we attend to it, as it lies, without taking into consideration the knowledge we derive from another quarter, we should hardly think there were a verse in the Gospel about which there is less scope for doubt. That which has principally given rise to the questions that have been agitated on this subject, is a passage in Josephus (Ant. b. 18. c. 1.), from which it appears, that the tax levied by Cyrenius, which was the first imposed on the people by the Romans, happened about ten or eleven years after the time here spoken of by L.; for, according to Josephus, it was after the expulsion of Archelaus, when Judea was reduced to the condition of a Roman province. As, at the time when that historian wrote, the event was both recent and memorable, it having given birth to an insurrection under Judas of Gallilee, which though soon quelled to appearance, became the latent source of a war, that ended in the ruin of the nation; it is impossible to think that that historian could either have erred through ignorance, or have attempted wilfully to misrepresent what must have been known to thousands then living. We cannot, therefore, with Maldonat, and others, cut short the matter at once, by sacrificing the credit of the historian to the authority of the Evangelist; because this will be found, in the issue, to do a material injury to the Evangelist himself. Let us try, then, whether, without doing violence to the words of Scripture, which, in cases of this kind, is too often done, we can explain them, so as not to be inconsistent

with the account given by the historian. And, first, as to the attempts which have been made by others, with the same view ; it is hardly necessary to mention, that some are for extirpating this verse altogether, as an interpolation. This is an expeditious method of getting rid of a difficulty, which I am sorry to see some learned men, in this age, so ready to adopt ; though, it must be owned, this expedient tends very much to shorten the critic's labour. But it is a sufficient answer to this, that it is a mere hypothesis, and, I will add, a most licentious hypothesis, inasmuch as it is not pretended, that there is a single MS. or edition, ancient translation, or commentary, in which the verse is wanting. When the thing, therefore, is properly viewed, we have here a cloud of witnesses, numerous and venerable, the same by whom the Gospel itself is attested to us, in opposition to a mere possibility. Of the same kind is the substitution of Saturninus or Quintillius for Cyrenius. Others, more moderate, attempt to remove the difficulty by a different interpretation of the passage, rendering it, after The. *This register was made before Cyrenius was governor of Syria ;* and, for this sense and application of the superlative πρωτος, for the comparative πρoτερος, examples are quoted from the Gospel of J. Thus, πρωτος μου ην, *He was before me.* J. i. 15. 30. and εμε πρωτον ὑμων μεμισηκεν, *It hated me before it hated you,* xv. 18. For some time past, this solution of the difficulty appears to have been the most favoured by interpreters, both abroad and at home. Now, there are several considerations which oppose the admission of such an idiom in the present case. First, among the sacred writers, it seems to be peculiar to the Evangelist J. Nothing similar is found in this Gospel or the Acts, both written by L. nor in any other writer of the N. T. I see no reason to consider it as an Hellenistic idiom, being without example in the Sep. Nor can it be called Oriental, as the Orientals have neither comparatives nor superlatives, but express the meaning of both by periphrasis. Secondly, The expressions are not similar. In such anomalous phrases, the discovery of the sense depends on the strictest observance of the arrangement. Πρωτος, in the instances quoted, is immediately prefixed, like a preposition, to the word it governs : thus, πρωτος μου, πρωτον ὑμων,—whereas here, it is separated from the word governed, Κυρηνιου, both by the verb εγενετο, and by other terms intervening. Thirdly, If the Evange-

list meant to tell us that this register was prior to another taken by Cyrenius, he ought to have said *πρωτη της [απογραφης] Κυρηνιου.* And if he meant to tell us that it was before Cyrenius was governor, he ought to have said, either *πρωτη του ἡγεμονευειν Κυρηνιου*, or *πρωτη της ἡγεμονιας Κυρηνιου.* In no case, therefore, can the examples quoted from J. serve to authorize a construction every way so irregular as this of L. is, on their hypothesis. I will add, fourthly, that, in regard to the quotations from J. though the expression is not strictly grammatical, it has that simplicity and plainness which warrant us to affirm, that it readily suggests the meaning to every attentive reader. With respect to this passage of L. we may justly affirm the reverse, that no person ever did, or could imagine the interpretation devised, who had not previously heard of an inconsistency which the obvious interpretation bore to the report of the Jewish historian, and who was not in quest of something, in the way of explanation, which might reconcile them. The hypothesis of the learned and indefatigable Dr. Lardner, to whose labours the Christian world is so highly indebted, is not without its difficulties. But of this presently.

[2] *Ηγεμονευοντος—Κυρηνιου.* There are two questions to which this participle gives rise; one concerning the import of the word *ἡγεμων;* the other concerning the intention of the participial form *ἡγεμονευοντος* here employed. As to the first, it is evident that *ἡγεμων*, in the language of the N. T. is not peculiarly appropriated to the president of a province, but is used with a good deal of latitude, being given also to the imperial procurators, such as Pontius Pilate, and even to the prefects, who had the principal charge of any business. It is in this sense, perhaps, that it is here applied to Cyrenius (or, as Tacitus calls him, Quirinius,) who certainly was not, in Herod's lifetime, president or governor of Syria. But, on this point, I do not find any difference amongst interpreters. As to the second, it is made a question, whether *ἡγεμονευοντος* ought to be understood as the genitive absolute of the participle, and, consequently, as intended to express the time when the event mentioned took place; or, as equivalent to the appellative *ἡγεμων*, and serving merely as a title derived from an office, which Cyrenius, some time or other, either before or after, possessed, and being in the genitive, as agreeing with *Κυρηνιου*, which is governed by *απογραφη.* Those

who construe the sentence in this manner, render it thus : *This was the first assessmen of Cyrenius governor of Syria.* It is this mode of interpretation, which has been adopted by Lardner, as to which I beg leave to offer to the reader's consideration the following reflections. It cannot be doubted the participle present often supplies the place of an appellative ; but, in such cases, if I remember right, it is the uniform practice to distingush it by the article. Thus it is : *ὁ βαπτιζων, ὁ πειραζων, ὁ αναγιναϑκων, ὁι οικοδομουντες, ὁι κυριευοντες.* On the contrary, when the participle is used as a participle, and particularly, when it is in the genitive absolute, it has not the article. Should it be argued, that it must, nevertheless, be a noun in this place, because it governs the genitive, and not the case of the verb ; I answer, that the same circumstance (not unusual in Gr.) takes place in all the examples shortly to be produced, as to which, there never was any doubt that the words were to be understood merely as participles in the genitive absolute. Secondly, no way can be more proper for attaining the sense of an author, in places where it may be doubtful, than by comparing those with similar expressions in other places of that author, about which all interpreters are agreed. Now, there cannot be a greater similarity in construction, than that which the beginning of the following chapter bears to the verse under examination : *Ἡγεμονευοντος Ποντιου Πιλατου της Ιουδαιας, και τετραρχουντος της Γαλιλαιας Ἡρωδου, Φιλιππου δε του αδελφου αυτου τετραρχουντος της Ιτουραιας και Τραχωνιτιδος χωρας, και Λυϑανιου της Αβιληνης τετραρχουντος —εγενετο ρημα Θεου επι Ιωαννην.* There cannot be a greater coincidence in syntax, than there is in the two passages now compared, insomuch that, if there be no ambiguity in the original of the passage quoted (and I have never heard it said that there is,) neither is there (notwithstanding the learned doctor's remark) any ambiguity in the original of the passage under examination. The similarity, in both, is striking, upon the slightest attention. The present participles in the genitive, without the article, the first of these participles, *ἡγεμονευοντος*, the same in both, and all of these governing the genitive, and not the accusative, the occasion of introducing these circumstances also similar. Now, it was never questioned that the participles in the beginning of the third chapter, are merely participles in the genitive absolute, employed solely for ascertaining the time when John's ministry commenced. I shall bring another example from the same au-

thor, which is also similar in every circumstance, (Acts xviii. 12.) ; *Γαλλιωνος δε ανθυπατευοντος της Αχαιας, κατεπεστησαν οι Ιουδαιοι τω Παυλω—— When Gallio was proconsul of Achaia, the Jews made insurrection against Paul.* This is no Hellenistic idiom of the Evangelist, it is perfectly classical ; *ὑπατευοντων* being often used by the Gr. writers of Roman affairs, as corresponding to *consulibus* in La. for marking, by the names of the consuls in office, the date of an event or transaction mentioned. The remark, therefore, that names of office, and participles supplying the place of such names, do not always imply that the office was possessed at the very time to which the action or event refers, though certainly true, is not applicable to the case in hand. The words, expressed in the precise manner above explained, can be neither names of office, nor introduced for the purpose of supplying such names, but participles of the present, specially intended for fixing the circumstance of time. I cannot, therefore, admit this hypothesis of Lardner (though at first inclinable to it,) without infringing the common rules of Syntax, and doing injury to the manner of the sacred writer ; I may rather say, to his meaning, manifestly shown, from instances in other places entirely similar. Further, had it been the Evangelist's intention to signify that the register was made by Cyrenius, the proper expression would have been *ὑπο Κυρηνιου ;* for, in that case, it would have clearly been (what it must have been the writer's intention to represent it) the register only of the empire *της οικουμενης*, executed by Cyrenius. One would think that the author of the Vul. had found the preposition in the Gr. MS. he used, as we read, in his translation, *a præside Syriæ Cyrino.* But some critics of the La. Church, particularly Maldonat, reject the preposition as interpolated. Si. evidently suspects it, and observes that, in the margin of some MS. La. Bibles, it is corrected in the notes called *correctoria.* Now, as this reading has no countenance from Gr. MSS. ancient commentaries, or printed editions, it is entitled to no regard. And, if it were, the only difference it would make on the sentence is this : the present reading implies no more, than that the event happened during the presidency of Cyrenius, the other would denote also that it was done by him ; for *ἡγεμονευοντος*, without the article, would still be a participle, and not a noun.

3 On all these accounts, I approve more the way suggested by Wet. for removing the difficulty, by the explanation of the verb *εγενετο*, than by putting the construction to the torture, to wrest a meaning from the sentence which otherwise it would never yield. It is certain, that the verb *γινεσθαι* has, in the N. T. other senses, beside the most common ones, *to be, to become, to be made, to be born, to happen.* And of those other meanings, less usual, but sufficiently warranted, the most applicable here is, *to take effect*, to produce its ordinary consequences. An example of this sense we have, Mt. v. 18. *εως αν παρελθη ὁ ουρανος και ἡ γη, ιωτα ἑν ἡ μια κεραια ου μη παρελθη απο του νομου εως αν παντα γενηται :* rendered in this version : *Sooner shall heaven and earth perish, than one iota, or one tittle of the law shall perish, without attaining its end.* The last clause is to the same purpose in the E. T. *Till all be fulfilled.* From the connexion of the verse with that immediately preceding, it is evident that the verb *γινεσθαι* is used in the one, in the same sense with *πληρωσαι* in the other : *ουκ ηλθον καταλυσαι αλλα πληρωσαι.* For the import of the word *πληρωσαι* in that passage, see the note in this version. We have another example in the same Gospel, vi. 10. *νηθητω το θελημα σου, Thy will be done ;* that is, *take effect, be executed.* The same phrase occurs also, xxvi. 42. L. xi. 2. and nearly the same, xxii. 42. *μη το θελημα μου, αλλα το σον γενεσθω.* Again, Mt. xviii. 19. our Lord, speaking of the request which two or three of his disciples shall agree in making, says, *γενησεται αυτοις*, it shall be accomplished for them, it shall have the desired effect. I shall produce but one other example, 1 Cor. xv. 54. *τοτε γενησεται λογος ὁ γεγραμμενος, Κατεποθη ὁ θανατος εις νικος : Then that saying of Scripture shall be accomplished, Death is swallowed up of victory.* Now, let it be remarked that, in the most common acceptation of the verb *γινομαι*, a law is made, *γινεται*, when it is enacted, not when it is obeyed ; a request, when it is presented, not when it is granted ; a promise, when it is given, not when it is performed ; a prediction, when it is announced, not when it is fulfilled. Yet it is in the latter only, though less common meaning, that the verb, in all the instances above produced, is, by the concurrent voice of all interpreters, to be understood. There is only one small point in which this solution appears to differ from that given by Wet. He, if I mistake not, retains the ordinary meaning of the verb *γινομαι*, and, in defence of the expression, ar-

gues, that it is usual to speak of a thing as done by that person by whom it was finished, although it had been begun and carried on by others. But to say that a business enjoined so early by Augustus, was performed so long after by Cyrenius, or during his government, gives immediate scope for the question, 'Where was, then, the necessity that Joseph should make a journey to Bethlehem, to be registered, with Mary his espoused wife, ten or eleven years before?' And even if it should be expressed that the business was at that time completed, it might seem strange that, in a country no larger than Judea, the execution of this order should have required so long a time. In the way I have rendered it, both objections are obviated: the register (whatever was the intention of it) was made in Herod's time, but had then little or no consequences. When, after the deposition and banishment of Archelaus, Judea was annexed to Syria, and converted into a province, the register of the inhabitants, formerly taken, served as a directory for laying on the *census*, to which the country was then subjected. Not but that there must have happened considerable changes on the people during that period. But the errors which these changes might occasion could, with proper attention, be easily rectified. And thus, it might be justly said, that an enrolment which had been made several years before, did not take effect, or produce consequences worthy of notice, till then. This solution does not differ, in the result, from that given by Whiston, and approved by Prideaux, but it differs in the method of educing the conclusion, amongst other objections to which Whiston's method is exposed, one is, that if the sense of *απογραθη* had been as unconnected with that of the verb *απογραφομαι*, in the preceding verse, as he makes it, the historian would not have introduced it with the demonstrative pronoun, and said, *Αυτη ἡ απογραφη*, which plainly refers us, for its meaning, to the verb, its conjugate, he had immediately used. This, upon the whole, is my opinion of this puzzling question. It is, however, proper to observe, that I offer it only as what appears to me a plausible way of solving the difficulty, without violating the syntax; but am far from having that confidence in it wherewith some critics express themselves concerning solutions which, to speak moderately, are not less exceptionable.

7. *Laid him in a manger*, ανεκλινεν αυτον εν τη φατνη. Bishop Pearce is of opinion, that by the word φατνη is here meant a bag of coarse cloth, like those out of which the horses of our troopers are fed when encamped. This bag he supposes to have been fastened to the wall, or some other part, not of the stable, but of the guest-chamber, or room for the reception of strangers, where Joseph and Mary were lodged, in which guest-chamber, intended solely for accommodating human creatures, and not cattle, there was a manger, but there was no bed; and this obliged Mary to have recourse to the manger for laying her child in. What could have led a man of Dr. Pearce's abilities to adopt an hypothesis so ill compacted, as well as unsupported, it is not easy to conceive. Perhaps a strong prejudice against the notion that the mother of our Lord should, on that occasion, have had no better accommodation than what a stable could afford. But in all such cases, the reflection ought ever to be present to our minds, that what we are inquiring into is not a matter of theory, but a point of fact; concerning the evidence of which, we shall never be capable of judging with impartiality, if we have allowed our minds to be pre-occupied with vain conceptions, in relation to fitness and dignity, of which we are not competent judges. If, along with sufficient evidence of the fact, there be nothing that contradicts the manifest principles of the understanding, or shocks that sense of right and wrong, which is the law of God written on our hearts, we ought to be satisfied. For that there should be things astonishing, or even unaccountable, in transactions so far superior to every other object of our meditations, is what we ought in reason to expect, ever remembering, that God's thoughts are not our thoughts, nor are our ways his ways. Mr. Harmer, [see Observations vol. i. p. 442. ed. 2d.] says, that as the horses in the East eat chiefly barley, they do not eat it out of a manger, as with us (for they have no mangers,) but out of bags of haircloth, which are hung about their heads for that purpose. From this observation of Bishop Pearce's, Dr. Priestley has drawn a conclusion, in a great measure the reverse, to wit, that they were all in a stable, but that there is no mention of a manger of any kind, the word φατνη, on his hypothesis, meaning only *stable*. That the word φατνη means *stable*, or rather *stall*, as well as *manger*, is admitted. *Manger* seems to have been the original signification, and the other meaning, *stall*, to have arisen from a

synecdoche of a part for the whole, as in La. *tectum* is sometimes used for *domus*, and *puppis* for *navis ;* or, as in Eng. *sail* for *ship*. But, abstracting from all other considerations, the words of the original are unfavourable to that philosopher's interpretation ; ανεκλινεν αυτον εν τη φατνη obviously implies, that this was the place wherein the child was laid, and whereby he was distinguished in point of place, not only from those without doors, but from those within. The Doctor has indeed attempted to give such a turn to the words, as may make εν τη φατνη relate in common to all the three preceding verbs, ετεκεν, εσπαργανωσεν, and ανεκλινεν ; but with what success, must be submitted to the learned. To mention the laying of a child, without saying where, is a very blank sort of information ; and when the place is named, we expect it to be what particularly marks the situation of the child, and not what he has in common with those who thus dispose of him, and perhaps with many others. If Mary had borne Jesus in her own house, would it have been natural to say, She brought forth her first-born son, and swathed him, and laid him, without adding a word, such as in a cradle, or on a couch, to denote where ? But if, for explanation, it had been added simply *in the house*, or *there*, we should have surely thought the whole clause exceedingly superfluous ; for who can suppose that she would have taken him to another house ? It strengthens my argument, that the word φατνη occurs again twice in this chapter, and is always connected with the position of the child, κειμενον εν τη φατνη. Nor can it be said with truth that εν τη φατνη may relate equally, as Dr. Priestley explains it, to all who had been named. If the word κειμενον had not been subjoined to βρεφος, I should admit the plausibility of this exposition ; but the participle κειμενον, as has been observed, requires some such supplement, and consequently appropriates what follows as the full expression of the situation of the babe. But to return to bishop Pearce's exposition : on what authority a bag made of goat's hair is believed to have been called φατνη, he has not thought fit to inform us. The like contrivance amongst ourselves, though very common, we never call *a manger*. The very quotations produced by Dr. Pearce confute his hypothesis. Homer represents the horse as chained to the φατνη, and getting loose from it only by breaking his chain. Could he mean to say, that he had been secured by being bound to a haircloth bag, and not to something which he could not carry off ? The quotation from

Virgil is precisely of the same kind, *abruptis fugit præsepia vinclis*. Those bags, Harmer tells us, are hung about the heads of the cattle; but surely they could never occasion the breaking of either chain or halter. It may be asked, What shall we say then to the authorities produced by Harmer, to wit, D'Arvieux, Thevenot, and Sir John Chardin, who affirm, that they use no mangers in the East, unless we bestow that name on the coarse bags above described? We will say that we admit the testimony of these witnessess, as evidence not only of what they saw themselves, but of what was then customary in the countries which they visited. At the same time, we do not admit it as an evidence of what had been the practice there, seventeen hundred years before, especially when, as to the more ancient usages, we have direct testimony that they were different. There is here no opposition of testimony. We find, therefore, no difficulty in believing both. The one concerns the practice of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, the other that of the first century alone. To obviate this, it has been affirmed, and is doubtless true, that the Asiatics are not so changeable as the Europeans, in what regards their manners and customs. But were we to conclude thence, that they never change at all, we should err more widely than if we should believe them as fickle as ourselves. The difference is only in degree. I have had occasion, in the Preliminary Dissertations, to indicate and to trace some of the changes which have obtained in opinions, in manners, and customs, and even in the import of words. Man is naturally mutable, and mutability, in some degree, cleaves to every thing that is human. It is indeed impossible that the revolutions (or changes affecting whole kingdoms and states) to which Syria and the neighbouring countries have been subjected, should not have produced great and numerous alterations in all the respects above mentioned. Their conquerors too, in different ages, have mostly been nations exceedingly different from one another, both in political principles and in religious ceremonies, the Chaldeans, the Persians, the Grecians, the Romans, the Arabians, and last of all the Turks. Are changes in government, such as these, compatible with a perfect uniformity in their fashions and customs? No certainly. Let it not, however, be imagined that I mean to depreciate such observations as those of Harmer. This is far from my intention. I know that, in many cases, they may be very

useful, and several of those made by that learned author, undoubtedly, are so; but all observations of that kind are then most safely applied, when they throw light upon a passage of Scripture which, misled by our own customs, we find obscure; and not when they serve to darken what is expressed both plainly and explicitly. If a present custom in the East, applied to any ancient fact recorded, makes a passage clear which is otherwise inexplicable, it is a very strong presumption, and in some cases even a proof, that their present is the continuation of their ancient practice. But let it not, on the other hand, be founded on as an axiom, that whatever is used at present in that part of the world was always so, or that whatever was once their fashion, is the fashion with them still; than both which nothing can be more evidently false. As to the point in question, the word φατνη is used in the Sep. as the version of a Heb. word, which manifestly denotes the manger, crib, or vessel, in a stable, out of which the cattle eat. The Heb. אבוס *ebus*, which is so rendered, appears, both from etymology and from use, to be of this import. See Job. xxxix. 9. Is. i. 3. Prov. xiv. 4. The same may be said, with truth, of the Syriac word אוריא *auria*, by which it is translated in that ancient version; and as to the Gr. term Phavorinus says, φατνη παρα του φαγειν γινεται. But though enough has been said to remove so slight a presumption founded on their present customs, I shall, on this article, give positive evidence, both that the practice was in Asia, in ancient times, to feed their cattle out of mangers, or vessels made of durable materials, as stone, wood, or metal, and that it was actually in such a vessel that our Lord was laid. First, that mangers were used Asia, particularly by the Persians, of whom Harmer tells us, from Thevenot, that at present they have in their stables no such implement; the authority of Herodotus will put beyond dispute. In relating the final victory obtained by the Greeks over the Persians, and the total expulsion of the latter out of Greece, he acquaints us that the tent of Mardonius, the commander in chief of the Persian army, was pillaged, and that there was found in it a brazen manger for his horses, which, on account of its singular beauty, was presented to the goddess Alea Minerva, in whose temple it was deposited. His words are [l. ix.], *Την δκηνην του Μαρδονιου ούτοι [Τεγεηται] εδαν όι διαρπαδαντες, τα τε αλλα εξ αυτης και την φατνην των ίππων εουδαν χαλκεην παδαν και ϑεης αξιην· την μεν νυν φατνην ταυτην την Μαρδονιου ανεθεδαν*

εις τον νηον της Αλεης Αθηναιης. Nobody will pretend that the historian could mean that Mardonius carried about with him a brass stable for his horses, which the Greeks found in his tent. Every circumstance of the story adds to the credibility of the fact, but more especially of that point with which alone my argument is concerned. We have here the testimony of an historian worthy of credit, particularly in matters which fell within his own knowledge, which when he wrote, were recent in respect of time, and in respect of place, transacted on the most public theatre, at that time, in the world; a testimony, besides, with the best means of confuting which, if it had been false, he furnished his cotemporaries, by telling them where this curious piece of furniture was to be seen. Now, let it be observed, that this story is still stronger evidence that the Persians were then accustomed to the use of mangers, than it is of the particular fact related. Had it answered any purpose to the historian to tell a falsehood, he would never have contrived a falsehood notoriously contradictory to the Persian customs, at that time well known in Greece. Neither could he himself be ignorant of their customs. Not to mention his extensive knowledge, he was an Asiatic, a native and citizen of Halicarnassus, a city of Caria in Asia Minor, and consequently in the neighbourhood of the Persian dominions. To this testimony I shall add that of Justin Martyr, the first of the Fathers after the disciples of the Apostles; he wrote about the middle of the second century. He says expressly, that when Joseph could find no place in the village of Bethlehem to lodge in, he betook himself to a cave near it, and that, when they were there, Mary bore the Messiah, and laid him in a manger. His words are [Dial. cum. Tryphone,] Επειδαν Ιωσηφ ουκ ειχεν εν τη κωμη εκεινη που καταλυσαι, εν σπηλαιω τινι συνεγγυς της κωμης κατελυσε, και τοτε αυτων οντων εκει, ετεχθη ἡ Μαρια τον χριστον και εν φατνη αυτον ετεθεικει. Now, nothing can be more evident, than that here the σπηλαιον, where Joseph and Mary were lodged, is distinguished from the φατνη where she laid the infant. Such natural caves as could in a strait afford shelter both to men and cattle, were not uncommon in that country; and a principle of humanity or of hospitality, for which the ancients were remarkable, might influence the people to bestow some labour upon them, in order to render them more commodious. This, at least, is not an implausible way of accounting for their finding a manger, and perhaps some other

conveniences, in such a place. But, whatever be in this, for I am no wise interested to promote the credit of the tradition, though very ancient; and though Origen, who wrote in the third century, confirms it, telling us, that at Bethlehem they showed the cave wherein Jesus was born, and the manger in the cave wherein he was swathed (contra Celsum, *Δεικνυται το εν Βηθλεεμ σπηλαιον ενθα εγεννηθη, και ἡ εν τω σπηλαιω φατνη εν ἡ εσπαργανωφη ;)* from these testimonies it is very evident, that in those days such implements in a stable, as we call *mangers*, were well known, and in common use in Judea. For, let it be remembered, that Justin was a native of Palestine, having been born in Neapolis of Samaria, the city which, in Scripture, is called *Sechem* and *Sichar*. Origen also had lived some time in the country. In which way soever, therefore, we understand the story of the cave, related by Justin, as a fiction, or as a fact, it is a full proof that they were not then unacquainted with the use of mangers.

[2] *In the house allotted to strangers, εν τω καταλυματι.* E. T. *In the inn.* I shall, here, not only for the vindication of the version, but for the further illustration of the whole passage, make a few observations on the houses built in the East, for the reception of strangers. Busbequius, ambassador at the Porte, from the emperors Ferdinand and Maximilian, a man well acquainted with the Turkish polity and manners, both in Europe and in Asia, where, on the public service, he had also occasion to be, mentions (Epis.1.) three sorts of houses built for the accommodation of travellers. The first is the *caravansary*, the most considerable, and that which, from its external magnificence, is the most apt to attract the attention of strangers. *It is*, says Busbequius, *a very large building ;* commonly lighted from the top, either by sky-lights, or by a spacious dome, which serves for ornament, as well as use. Into this edifice, which is all under one roof, and has no partitions, all travellers, and their cattle, are admitted promiscuously. The only division in it, is an arena in the middle for the servants, the beasts, and the baggage, enclosed with a parapet, three feet high, which is so broad as to reach the wall of the house on every side, and thus to form a stone bench all along the walls, for accommodating the travellers, and raising them above the level of the horses, camels, and mules. This bench is commonly from four to six feet broad. There are chimneys, at proper distances, in the walls. Every little party has such a proportion

of this bench, with a chimney, as must serve for kitchen, parlour, and bed-chamber. They use the provisions which they bring with them, or which they purchase in the place. At night the saddle-cloth, and their own upper garments, commonly serve for bed-clothes, and the saddle for a pillow. The public supplies them only in lodging. The account given by this Imperial minister, in the sixteenth century, does not materially differ, in any thing, from what is related by Tournefort, and other travellers of the present age. Busbequius calls the second sort of public house *Xenodochium*, which, he says, is only to be found in a few places. The former is intended chiefly for the accommodation of those travelling companies, called *caravans*, from which it derives its name ; the latter receives no cattle, nor are the strangers huddled together as in the caravansary, but are decently accommodated in separate apartments, and supplied at the public charge for three days, if they choose to stay so long, in moderate but wholesome food. The third he calls *stabulum*, and of this kind he mentions some as very capacious, though not so magnificent as the caravansary. Here also the travellers and their cattle were under the same roof, and not separated by any partition-wall from each other. Only the former possessed the one side, which had at least one chimney, and the latter the other. When he himself, in travelling, was forced to put up with such quarters (for this sometimes happened,) he tells us that he made the curtains of his tent serve for a partition between him and the other travellers. Now, of the three sorts, it is probable that these two only, the *xenodochium* and the *stabulum*, were known in the days of the Apostles. Indeed the first mentioned, the *caravansary*, appears no other than an improvement of the *stabulum*, the plan being much enlarged, and perhaps a few accommodations added ; of all which it is likely that the annual pilgrimages to Mecca, after the establishment of Mahometism in the East, first suggested the necessity. Of the two other kinds there appear such traces in Scripture as render it at least credible that they were both in common use. The *καταλυμα* mentioned twice by this Evangelist, once by Mr. and occurring sometimes in the Sep. answers to the *xenodochium* of Busbequius ; the *παιδοχειον* of L. in conformity to its name, corresponds to the *stabulum*, of the other. It is accordingly so rendered in the Vul. whereas *diversorium* is that by which *καταλυμα* is rendered in that translation.

All the later translators into La. Er. Ar. Zu. Cas. and Be. less properly confound these words, rendering both *diversorium*. In cases of this kind, immediately depending on the customs of a country, the old translator who, from his vicinity in time and place, had the best opportunity of knowing the customs, is entitled to the preference. It deserves our notice also, that the ancient Sy. never confounds the two words. In this, therefore, I agree with Bishop Pearce, that *πανδοχειον* and *καταλυμα* are not synonymous. As the same distinction, however, does not obtain with us which obtained with them, we have not names exactly corresponding; but there is resemblance enough in the chief particulars to make the term *inn*, a tolerable version of the word *πανδοχειον* but not of *καταλυμα*; for that cannot be called an *inn* where the lodges are at no charges, which was most probably the case of the *καταλυμα*. It was necessary that there should be at Jerusalem, whither the three great festivals brought regularly, thrice in the year, an immense concourse of people, very many of the former kind, the *καταλυματα*. There was but one *καταλυμα*, it seems, at Bethlehem, a small village, and, when Joseph came thither, it was full. For this reason, the pious pair, if they did not betake themselves to the cave, according to the tradition above mentioned, must have had recourse to the homely harbourage of a *πανδοχειον*, or *stabulum*. This, in my opinion, removes every difficulty, and is perfectly consistent with every circumstance related by the Evangelist. The place was not properly *a stable*, in our sense of the word, a house only for cattle, but was intended for supplying travellers, as to this day they are supplied in the East, with both stable and lodging under the same roof. Nor did it belong to what is called the *καταλυμα*, the house allotted for the reception of strangers, with which it had no connexion. They were different kinds of what, in old language, were called *hostelries*, and quite independent on each other. By this explanation, without needing to recur to a cave without the town (an hypothesis liable to some obvious objections,) we can admit Wet.'s reasoning in all its force. "If," says he, "the manger was a part of the stable, and the stable a part of the inn, he who had room in the stable had room in the inn. When Luke, therefore, says, that there was no room for them in the inn, he shows that the stable was unconnected

with the inn." The pains that has been taken by some learned men to furnish our Lord and his parents on this occasion with better quarters, I cannot help thinking, savours somewhat of that ancient prejudice called *the scandal of the cross*, which has clung to our religion from the beginning, and which, in the first ages, produced all the extravagances of the Docetæ, and many others. This prejudice, wherever it prevails, displays a wonderful dexterity in removing, or at least weakening, those circumstances in the history of our Lord, which are, in the world's account, humiliating. It is an amazing conceit, in a man of Wet.'s abilities, to fancy that there was more dignity in our Lord's being born in a cave than in a stable; because, forsooth, the fables of idolaters, represent Rhea as having brought forth Jupiter in a cave. "A cave," says he, "has something in it venerable and divine, whereas nothing is more despicable and rustic than a stable." *Antrum nobis aliquid venerandum et divinum: stabulum vero humile et rusticum repræsentat.* To remarks of this kind, so unsuitable to the spirit of our religion, it is sufficient to answer in the words of our Lord [L. xvi. 15.], *Το εν ανθρωποις ὑψηλον, βδελυγμα ενωπιον του Θεου εστιν.*

9. *A divine glory*, δοξα Κυριου. E. T. *The glory of the Lord.* It was a known figure among the Hebrews, to raise, by the name of God, the import of any thing mentioned, to the highest degree possible. See the note on verse 40th.

14. *In the highest heaven*, εν ὑψιστοις. E. T. *In the highest.* It is not agreeable to the Eng. idiom to use an adjective so indefinitely as the word *highest*, without a substantive, would, in this place, be. When it is employed as a name of God, the context never fails to show the meaning, and thereby remove all appearance of impropriety. As the Jews reckoned three heavens, *the highest* was considered as the place of the throne of God. When we find it contrasted with earth, as in this verse, we have reason to assign it this meaning: the one is mentioned as the habitation of God, the other as that of men. This is entirely in the Jewish manner. *God is in heaven and thou upon the earth* (Eccl. v. 2.) *Thy will be done upon the earth, as it is in heaven* (Mt. vi. 10). The plural number is used in the original, because the Heb. word for *heaven* is never in the singular. The only place in the O. T. where the phrase

εν ὑψιστοις is employed by the 70, is Job xvi. 19. in which it is evidently used in the same sense as by the Evangelist here.

* *Peace upon the earth, and good will towards men, επι γης ειρηνη, εν ανθρωποις ευδοκια.* Vul. *In terra pax hominibus bonæ voluntatis.* The La. version is evidently founded on a different reading of the original. Accordingly, in the Al. and Cam. MSS. but in no other, we find *ευδοκιας* in the genitive. The Go. and the Sax. are the only translations which, with the Vul. favour this reading. Since the passage, as commonly read, admits a meaning, at least as clear and apposite as that which we find in the Vul. and as the authorities which support the former are incomparably superior, both in number and in value, to those which favour the latter, it is plain that no change ought to be made. I do not think it an objection of any weight against the common reading, that the copulative is wanting before the last member. It would have some weight in simple narrative, but in a doxology, such as this, has none at all. The Sy. indeed, has the conjunction prefixed to this clause as well as to the preceding; but as there is not for this the authority of any Gr. MS. it has probably been inserted by the translator, merely to render the expression more complete. In the way the passage is rendered in the Vul. it is difficult to say, with any degree of confidence, what is the meaning. The most likely, when we consider the ordinary import of the words in Scripture, is that which may be expressed in this manner, *peace upon the earth to the men whom God favoureth.* This sense, however, it must be owned, does but ill suit the context, in which the angels are represented as saying, that the good news which they bring shall prove matter of great joy to all the people. It ought surely, in that case, to have been said only to some of the people, namely, to those whom God favoureth. That none can enjoy true peace whom God does not favour, is manifest; but then, by the first expression, we are taught, that God, in sending the Messiah, favours all the people; by the second, that he favours only a part. Though these different sentiments may, perhaps, on different views of the subject, both be justified; yet, as there is nothing here to suggest a different view, the most consistent interpretation is the most probable. *The peace of good will*, which bishop Pearce has proposed in interpreting the words, is an unscriptural, and I even think, unnatural, expression.

19. *Weighing*, συμβαλλουσα. Vul. Fr. Zu. Be. *Conferens.* Cas. to the same purpose, *Perpendens.* Elsner has produced a number of examples from Pagan authors, to prove that the word συμβαλλουσα may be here most fitly rendered into La. *Mentem eorum probe assecuta*, having attained the understanding of them. He is in this followed by Palairet: only the latter prefers rendering the word more simply, *intelligens*, understanding them. Raphelius has shown that, if we were to inspect the places whence Elsner's examples were taken, we should find, both from the sentence itself, and from the context, that the verb is at least as susceptible of one or other of these significations, *to weigh*, *to compare*, *to conjecture*, as of that which he gives it. I confess, that to me it appears much more susceptible of this sense than of the other. Wet. seems to have been of the same opinion. After producing many similar quotations, from Grecian authors, which manifestly yield a good and apposite meaning so interpreted, he concludes with observing, "De conjectoribus et interpretibus sominorum oraculorumque dicitur." Here I cannot avoid making a few observations on the manner in which authorities are sometimes alleged by critics. They seem to think that, if the words of a quotation, taken by themselves, make sense, when interpreted in the way they propose, it is sufficient evidence that they have given the meaning of the author in that place. Now this is, in reality, no evidence at all. That such an interpretation yields *a sense*, is one thing, that it yields *the sense* of the author, is another. Of two different meanings, the chief consideration, which can reasonably ascertain the preference, is, when one clearly suits the scope of the author, and the connexion of the paragraph, and the other does not. Yet, if the sentence may be considered independently, it may make sense either way explained. That this is the case with Elsner's examples, wherein the verb συμβαλλειν is equally capable of being translated *to guess*, as *to understand*, I should think it losing time to illustrate. The judicious critic, when he considers the connexion, will find them, if I mistake not, more capable of being rendered in the former way than in the latter. They all relate to dreams and oracles, concerning which the heathens themselves admitted that there could be no certain knowledge. I observe 2dly, That in criticising the inspired writers, whose manner is, in many respects, peculiar, I should think it exceedingly obvious, that the first

first recourse for authorities ought to be to the writer himself, or to the other sacred penmen who employ the word in question [Diss. IV. §4—8.] The only writer in the N. T. who uses the verb συμβαλλω is L. In five places, beside this, he has employed it; but in none of the five, will it admit the sense which Elsner assigns it here. The same thing may be affirmed, with truth, concerning those passages wherein it occurs in the Sep. and the Apocrypha. Need I add, that the Sy. version, which renders the word in this place ממחמא perfectly agrees with the Vul.? Indeed, as far as the sense is concerned, I do not recollect to have observed any difference among translators; and that even Mary did not understand every thing relating to her son, we learn from the 50th verse of this chapter. I shall only further observe in passing (but I do not lay any stress on this as an argument,) that it is not in the manner of the sacred writers to celebrate the abilities of the saints, but their virtues. Whenever they commend, they hold forth truth an object of imitation to their readers. The understanding of this excellent personage was merely an ability or talent: but her weighing every thing that related to this most important subject,and carefully treasuring it up in her memory, was an evidence of her piety, and of the ardent desire she had to learn the things of God. This is a thing imitable by others; but neither natural acuteness of understanding, nor supernatural gifts, can properly be objects of imitation to us.

22. *Their purification*, καθαρισμου αυτων. E. T. *Her purification.* Vul. *Purgationis ejus.* In a very few Gr. copies, there is a diversity of reading. The Cam. and three others of less note, for αυτων read αυτου, thus making it *his purification.* The Com. which had in this been followed by Be. and the two printers, Plantin and Elzevir, read αυτης, *her.* The Cop. and Ara. versions omit the pronoun altogether. Wet. has classed the Vul. as supporting the few Gr. MSS. which read αυτου, *his*, and I cannot help thinking him in the right. *Ejus* is of itself equivocal, meaning either *his* or *her.* Which of the two is meant, in a particular case, must always be learned from the connexion of the words. Now the pronoun is so connected here as, by the ordinary rules of interpretation, not to admit another meaning than *his.* Mary is not mentioned in the foregoing verse, nor even in that which preceded it. The last time she is mentioned is in v. 19. relating to a quite different matter. Jesus

is mentioned in the words immediately preceding; and the same personal pronoun occurs in the two verses, both before and after, referring to him. But the verses themselves in the Vul. will make this evident without a comment. *Et postquam consummati sunt dies octo, ut circumcideretur puer, vocatum est nomen ejus Jesus, quod vocatum est ab angelo, priusquam in utero conciperetur. Et postquam impleti sunt dies purgationis ejus secundum legem Moysi, tulerunt illum in Jerusalem, ut sistercut cum Domino.* Be this, however, as it will, all the translations from the Vul. which I have seen, consider *ejus*, as in this place, feminine. Were the question, what, in our judgment, the expression should be, and not what it actually is (questions often confounded by the critics,) I should, for obvious reasons, strongly incline, as others have done, to read *αυτης*, *her*, in preference to all other readings. But I must acknowledge that upon examination, it appears to be that reading, which, of all those above mentioned, has the least support from positive evidence. I should rather say, it has none at all. Not a single MS. is there, not one ancient writer, or old translation, if we except the Vul.; and how equivocal its testimony in this place is, has been shown already. For my part, I rather consider it, with Wet. as one witness for the reading in the Cam. All the evidence then is reduced to cardinal Ximenes, who will not be thought of great weight with those who consider the freedoms which he sometimes took, in order to produce in his Gr. edition a closer conformity to the Vul. Be. does not pretend the authority of MSS. for his following, in this passage, the Com. His only reason is the incongruity which he found in the ordinary reading, *αυτων*. Nor is it of any weight that some printers followed, in this, his edition. Let us then consider briefly, but impartially, those apparent incongruities in the common reading, which make people so unwilling to receive it. One is, it is not conformable to the style of the law of Moses on this subject. The purification after child-birth is never called the purification of the child, but of the mother. Though this is certainly true, it may be justly affirmed that it is conformable to the spirit of the law to consider what may be called the legal state of the mother, and of the child suckled by her, as the same. Now, though the uncleanness of the mother, after bearing a male child, lasted only seven days, she remained thirty-three days longer debarred from touching any hallowed thing,

or going into the sanctuary. Nor could the first-born male be legally presented to the Lord, and redeemed, till he was a month old at least. But as the time was not, like that of circumcision, fixed to a particular day, it is not unlikely that it may have been customary, because convenient, for those who lived at a distance from Jerusalem, to allot the same time for the purification and the redemption (as was actually done in this case,) and to consider the ceremonies in a complex view, as regarding both mother and child. The only other objection which operates powerfully against the reception of the common reading, is, that it appears to attribute impurity of some kind or other to our Lord Jesus, from which he needed to be cleansed. But nothing is more certain than what is observed by Gro. that this, notwithstanding its name, implied no more than certain restraints upon the person, till after the performance of certain rites. We are apt to connect with the notion of impurity, or the uncleanness described in the ceremonial law, some degree of guilt or moral pravity. But this is entirely without foundation. There was an uncleanness contracted by the touch of a dead body; but this being often unavoidable, and sometimes accidental, it was not in any sense a transgression, unless in a few particular cases. It would have been indeed a transgression, if voluntary, in the high priest, because to him expressly prohibited. His sacred functions required that the necessary care about the interment of persons deceased, though nearly connected with him, should be committed to other hands. The ordinary priests, however, were allowed to defile themselves for near relations. And, as they were permitted, their defilement, in such cases, was no transgression, and consequently implied no sin. Nay more, in many cases, it was a man's duty to defile himself, in the sense of the ceremonial law. Nobody will deny, that it was necessary, and therefore a duty, to take care of the dying, and to bury the dead. Yet this duty could not be performed without occasioning uncleanness. Nay, the ceremonial law itself required the doing of that which produced this defilement. The priest and others, employed in sacrificing and burning the red heifer, and gathering her ashes, were all rendered unclean by what they did, yet they were obliged by law to do it. Num. xix. 7, 8, 10. It was, therefore, in some cases, a man's duty to make himself unclean. If, indeed, a person in this state had entered the congregation of the Lord, or touched any thing intentionally, and without necessity, not permitted to such, or had neglected

to use, in due time, the rites of cleansing, he would, by this presumption, have rendered himself a transgressor, but not by what is called defiling himself, which the ceremonial law allowed in many cases, and which, in some cases, the moral law, or law of nature, nay, even the ceremonial law, required.

23. *Every male who is the first-born of his mother*, *παν αρσεν διανοιγον μητραν*. Dod. *Every first-born male.* I should, probably, have adopted this expression of Dod. as briefer, if there did not appear an ambiguity in it, which is not in the other. A son may, not improperly, be called the first-born male, who is born before all the other male children of the family, notwithstanding that there may have been one or more females born before him. And if I mistake not, we frequently use the phrase in this meaning. But such a child is not *αρσεν διανοιγον μητραν*, and, consequently, not a male who is the *first-born* in the sense of this law, which takes place only when the first child which a woman bears, is a male. There is the greater reason for remarking the difference, because the Jews, themselves, made a distinction between the first-born, when it denotes the heir or person entitled to a double portion of his father's estate, and to some other privileges; and the first-born, when it denotes a person who is consecrated to God by his birth, and must in due time be redeemed. Such were, upon the old constitution, before God selected for himself the tribe of Levi in their stead, destined for the priesthood. Now, this sacred prerogative did not always coincide with the civil rights of primogeniture. Unless the child was at once the first-born of his mother, and the eldest son of his father in lawful wedlock, he was not entitled to the civil rights of the first-born, or a double portion of the inheritance. He might, nevertheless, be a first-born son in the religious sense, and subjected to this law of consecration and redemption. The Patriarch Jacob had, by different wives, two sons, Reuben and Joseph, each of whom came under the description here given of *αρσεν διανοιγον μητραν*, and so was consecrated by his birth. But Reuben alone was entitled to the patrimony of the first-born (if he had not forfeited it by his criminal behaviour,) as being the first-fruits of both parents. (See Gen. xlix. 3, 4. 1 Chron. v. 1, 2.) It is worthy of remark that, on Reuben's forfeiture, even the civil prerogative, the double portion, did not descend, according to our notions of seniority, to the son

next in age to Reuben ; *for*, says the sacred historian, *he* [Reuben] *was the first-born ; but forasmuch as he defiled his father's bed, his birth-right was given unto the sons of Joseph.* This does not appear to have happened in consequence of a particular destination in Joseph's favour, else it is probable that, in the history, notice would have been taken of that circumstance, but, on the failure of Reuben, to have fallen to Joseph in course. Now, according to the European rules of succession, all the other sons of Jacob by Leah, to wit, Simeon, Levi, Judah, Issachar, and Zebulun, as being elder than Joseph, had a preferable title. But eldership is one thing, and primogeniture another. When there was no claim to primogeniture in a family ; as, when the first-born was a female, or had died ; the double portion came, of course, to the senior brother ; but the sacred character could not be transferred. In regard to Dan the first-born of Bilhah, and Gad the first-born of Zilpah, not only had they no title to the civil rights of primogeniture, but it is even doubtful, by reason of the servile condition of the mothers, whether they could be accounted *holy* by their birth. It is universally admitted that Isaac, though the younger son, being the child of a free-woman, while Ishmael, the elder son, was the child of a slave, was alone entitled to all the prerogatives of primogeniture, both sacred and civil. A Gentile mother is also, by the Rabbies, deemed incapable of conveying the rights of the first-born of either kind to her offspring. Any glaring deformity, a defect or redundancy in any of the members, effectually divested the first-born of his sacred character, but not of his patrimonial birth-right. A number of cases have been put by the Rabbies, which are more curious than important, in order to show when the two species of right coincided in the same individual, and when they did not. But they are not, in every thing, unanimous on this subject ; and their decisions, though specious, are not always satisfactory. See Selden, lib. De successionibus, &c. ad leges Ebræorum, cap. vii.

[2] *Is consecrated to the Lord*, ἁγιον τω Κυριω κληθησεται. E. T. *Shall be called holy to the Lord.* P. R. Si. Sa. Beau. *sera consacré au Seigneur.* An. *Shall be consecrated to the Lord.* It has been frequently observed, and justly, that *to be called*, and *to be*, often mean the same thing in the Hebrew idiom. The word *called* has, with them, in such cases, nearly the import of the Eng.

words *held, acknowledged, accounted.* Now, that a thing is acknowledged to be of a particular kind, is considered as a consequence of its being of that kind, previously to the acknowledgment. It follows, that if, in translating such sentences, the verb καλεω be entirely dropt, and the epithet *holy* be supplied by the participle perfect of an active verb, the future tense cannot be retained, without turning a simple declaration of what is, into a command of something to be done. *To consecrate*, doubtless, gives a more perspicuous sense, in Eng. than *to call holy*. Yet, *shall be consecrated* would, in this place, imply more than is implied in the original. It would imply an order for the performance of some solemn ceremony of consecration, such, for example, as was used when God commanded Moses to consecrate Aaron and his sons. This future, thus employed, has in our language, the effect of the imperative: whereas, in the present instance, it is manifestly the intention of the writer to inform us, that this single circumstance, in the birth of a male, that he is the first-born of his mother, does, of itself, consecrate him. In such cases, therefore, the words are more accurately, as well as perspicuously, rendered, *is consecrated*, than *shall be consecrated to the Lord.* In the former way the words appear, as they ought, not a precept, but an affirmation. If, instead of a participle, an adjective be employed, the future may, without impropriety, be retained. The versions of Hey. and Wes. are both good. The first says, *shall be held sacred to the Lord;* the second, *shall be holy to the Lord.* In neither of these is there any appearance of a command of what is to be done; each is a distinct declaration of what obtains in every such instance.

24. *A pair of turtle-doves, or two young pigeons.* This was the offering required from the poor. Those in better circumstances were commanded to bring a lamb of the first year, for a burnt-offering, and a turtle-dove, or a young pigeon, for a sin-offering.

30, 31. *The Saviour whom thou hast provided,* το σωτηριον σου ὁ ἡτοιμασας. E. T. *Thy salvation which thou hast prepared.* In every language, we sometimes meet with such tropes as the abstract for the concrete, the cause for the effect, and the like. In the Oriental tongues, however, they seem to be more common than in most others. Thus, God is called our defence, our song, our hope; that is, our defender, the subject of our song, the object of our hope.

But when, in any occurrence, the words literally translated appear but ill adapted to the idiom of our tongue, or occasion obscurity, it is better to express the sense in plain words.

33. *Joseph, Ιωσηφ.* Vul. *pater ejus.* The Cam. with three other MSS. *ὁ πατηρ αυτου.* With this agree the Cop. Arm. and Sax. versions.

38. *To all those in Jerusalem, who expected deliverance, πασι τοις προσδεχομενοις λυτρωσιν εν Ἱερουσαλημ.* E. T. *To all them that looked for redemption in Jerusalem.* Vul. *Omnibus qui expectabant redemptionem Israel.* This version is evidently founded on a different reading. It is favoured by the Vat. which is singular, in having *του Ισραηλ* for *εν Ιερουσαλημ.* Three MSS. of small account, read *εν τω Ισραηλ.* The Al. and two others of less note, read *Ἱερουσαλημ*, without the preposition, and thus make the meaning, *the deliverance of Jerusalem.* This reading is followed by the Sy. Go. Sax. and Cop. versions. As these differences make no material alteration on the sense, and as the common reading is incomparably better supported than any other, and entirely suited to the scope of the passage, it is, in every respect, entitled to the preference. The expectation of the Messiah, though very general, was not universal.

40. *Adorned with a divine gracefulness, χαρις Θεου ην επ αυτω.* E. T. *The grace of God was upon him.* A verbal translation sometimes expresses the sense with sufficient clearness; and sometimes, though obscure or equivocal, it is not more so than the original. In either case, it admits a plausible apology: but here, I imagine, the words of the Evangelist will, to a discerning reader, suggest a meaning which can hardly be said to be conveyed to any, by what is called the literal version. The word *χαρις* has, in Scripture, several significations, to which there is not one Eng. word that will, in all cases, answer. Our translators have been as attentive to uniformity as most others; yet, for this word, which is oftenest rendered *grace*, they have, on different occasions, employed one or other of the following, *favour, liberality, benefit, gift, sake, cause, pleasure, thank, thankworthy, acceptable;* and even these are not all. Let it not be concluded hence, that the Gr. word must be very equivocal and indefinite. Notwithstanding the aforesaid remark, it

is very rarely so. But it is commonly the words in immediate connexion, which, in all languages, limit the acceptation of one another, and put the meaning beyond a doubt. The word *grace*, in Eng. admits a considerable latitude of signification, as well as the Gr. *χαρις*, yet is seldom so situated as to appear, to the intelligent, liable to be misunderstood. A reader of discernment will be sensible, that use in the language as truly fixes these limits, as it does the common acceptation of words, or the rules of inflection and construction. I have preferred *gracefulness*, in the version of this passage, as more explicit; though it cannot be denied that the word *grace* often bears the same meaning. Nay, I must add that, in this sense, it corresponds to the most common meaning of the Gr. term in classical writers. But this is a sense which, though not so common, is not without precedent in the sacred penmen, and particularly in this Evangelist. In ch. iv. 22. of this Gospel, the term is manifestly used in the same meaning: *Εθαυμαζον επι τοις λογοις της χαριτος τοις εκπορευομενοις εκ του στοματος αυτου:* here rendered, *Were astonished at the words, full of grace, which he uttered.* The charms of his elocution, which had an irresistible effect on the hearers, are evidently here pointed out. *Gracious words*, in the common translation, are not at all suited to the scope of the passage. See the note on that place. The word appears to me to be used in the same sense, Acts iv. 33. where the historian, speaking of the testimony which the Apostles gave in behalf of their master, when they entered on their ministry, says, *Χαρις τε μεγαλη ην επι παντας αυτους;* to denote the divine eloquence wherewith they expressed themselves, agreeably to the promise of their Lord, that they should receive a mouth and wisdom, which all their adversaries should not be able to withstand. In like manner, I take this to be the import of the word, Acts vii. 10. where Stephen says of the Patriarch Joseph, *Ὁ Θεος εδωκεν αυτω χαριν και σοφιαν εναντιον Φαραω.* I acknowledge that our translators have, not implausibly, rendered the words, *God gave him favour and wisdom in the sight of Pharaoh.* It is, however, more probable, and more agreeable to the rules of interpretation, that the gifts, *χαριν και σοφιαν*, thus coupled, should be understood as denoting distinct personal talents bestowed on Joseph, and not that only one of them, *σοφιαν*, should express a personal quality, and that *χαριν* should denote, barely, the effect of the other, or that affection which the discovery of his wisdom would procure him. The

sense, therefore, in my opinion, is, that God united in Joseph, that discernment, which qualified him for giving the best counsel, with those graces of elocution, which conciliated favour, and produced persuasion. *Χαρις* is also used in this manner by the Apostle Paul, Eph. iv. 29. Col. iv. 6. The addition of *Θεου* to *χαρις*, makes, in the Hebrew idiom, a kind of superlative, raising the signification as much as possible. For *χαρις* is not, like *πιστις*, expressive merely of a mental quality, but refers to effects both outward and sensible. (See Mr. xi. 22. N.) Thus, *αστειος τω Θεω*, applied to Moses, Acts vii. 20. when an infant, signifies *extremely beautiful.* As such expressions denote the highest degree of a valuable quality, they have, doubtless, arisen from the conviction, that God is to be regarded as the source whence every good and perfect gift descends. Wet. gives, in effect, the same explanation of this passage. For further confirming the version here given, it may be also observed, that when the Evangelists say any thing in relation to the characters of the persons of whom they write (which is but seldom,) their words, rightly explained, will always be found to convey a precise and distinct sentiment, and not to prove expressions merely indefinite, of what is good or bad in general. Now, the common version of this passage is exactly such a vague expression. For, to say that *χαρις* here means favour, is to say that the historian tells us nothing which we are not told verse 52. where it is said *he advanced in favour with God and man.* Now, I do not find that these writers are chargeable with such repetitions, so quickly recurring. Besides, in this acceptation, the phrase would not be, *χαρις ην επ' αυτω ;* but *ευρε χαριν ενωπιον του Θεου*, or *παρα τω Θεω και προς τον λαον.* The thing to which, in my judgment, the historian here particularly points, is that graceful dignity in our Lord's manner which at once engaged the love, and commanded the respect, of all who heard him. To this we find several allusions made in these writings. See Mt. vii. 28, 29. Mr. i. 22. L. iv. 22. 32. J. vii. 46. All these passages, put together, indicate an authority, in his manner, superior to human, blended with the most condescending sweetness. With this distinguishing quality the Evangelist here acquaints us that Jesus was attended from his childhood.

44. *In the company, εν τη συνοδια. Συνοδια* means, properly, *a company of travellers.* As at the three great festivals, all the

men who were able, were obliged, and many women chose, at least at the passover, to attend the celebration at Jerusalem, they were wont, for their greater security against the attacks of robbers on the road, to travel in large companies. All who came, not only from the same city, but from the same canton or district, made one company. They carried necessaries along with them, and tents for their lodging at night. Sometimes, in hot weather, they travelled all night, and rested in the day. This is nearly the manner of travelling, in the East, to this hour. Such companies they now call *caravans*, and, in several places, have got houses fitted up for their reception, called *caravansaries*. See N. on v. 7. [2]. This account of their manner of travelling furnishes a ready answer to the question, How could Joseph and Mary make a day's journey, without discovering before night, that Jesus was not in the company? In the day time, we may reasonably presume, that the travellers would, as occasion, business, or inclination, led them, mingle with different parties of their friends and acquaintance; but that, in the evening, when they were about to encamp, every one would join the family to which he belonged. As Jesus did not appear, when it was growing late, his parents first sought him where they supposed he would most probably be, amongst his relations and acquaintance, and not finding him, returned to Jerusalem.

48. *But they who saw him, were amazed, και ιδοντες αυτον εξεπλαγησαν.* E. T. *And when they saw him, they were amazed;* that is, when Joseph and Mary (mentioned ver. 43.) saw him. This is the common way of rendering the words, and they are doubtless susceptible of this interpretation; but they are also susceptible of that here given. This is taken notice of by Bowyer, as an exposition suggested by Markland. Indeed, if the article had been prefixed to *ιδοντες*, I should not have thought the words capable of any other meaning. As they stand, the omission, especially after *πας* or *παντες*, and a participle in the nominative, with the article, is not unprecedented. Thus, Mt. xi. 28. *Δευτε προς με παντες οι κοπιωντες και πεφορτισμενοι, καγω αναπαυσω υμας.* It may, indeed, be objected that, in this example, both the participles are to be understood as relating to the same persons; in which case, the repetition of the article would hardly be proper. This, I acknowledge, may be the case, but the suppression of the article will not be admitted as

sufficient evidence that it is. For, in L. xiv. 11. where we read, *πας ὁ ὑψων ἑαυτον ταπεινοθησεται, και ταπεινων ἑαυτον ὑψωθησεται*, the two participles, so far from being applicable to the same individual, are contrasted, as representing persons of opposite characters. Yet the article, as well as the adjective *πας*, are omitted before the second participle: but every body must be sensible that they are understood as equally belonging to both. The case of the passage under review is similar. *Εξισταντο δε παντες οἱ ακουοντες αυτου, επι τη συνεσει και ταις αποκρισεσιν αυτου, και ιδοντες αυτον εξεπλαγησαν.* Here the *παντες οἱ* may be understood as repeated before the second participle. An inconsiderable alteration in the arrangement of the words will make this criticism more sensibly felt. *Παντες δε οἱ ακουοντες αυτου εξισταντο, και ιδοντες αυτον εξεπλαγησαν, επι τη συνεσει και ταις αποκρισεσιν αυτου.* For the sake of perspicuity, I have followed this order in the version. But as the words are capable of the other interpretation above mentioned, my reasons for preferring that here given are these: 1st, In the ordinary explanation, the distance is rather too great between the participle in v. 48. and the nouns to which it refers in v. 43. This has made Be. think it necessary to supply the words *parentes ejus*, for removing the obscurity; and in this he has been followed by several other interpreters. 2dly, The meaning, here given, appears to me better suited to the scope of the passage. His parents may be said to have had reason of surprise, or even amazement, when they discovered that he was not in their company; but surely, to them at least, there was nothing peculiarly surprising, in finding that he was not amusing himself with boys, but in the temple, among the doctors, discoursing on the most important subjects. I may say justly that, to them, who knew whence he was, there was less ground of amazement at the wisdom and understanding displayed in his answers, than to any other human being. 3dly, It appears the intention of the Evangelist, in this passage, to impress us with a sense of the extraordinary attainment of our Lord, in wisdom and knowledge, even in childhood, from the effect which the discovery of them produced on others. All in the temple who, though they did not see him, were within hearing, and could judge from what they heard, were astonished at the propriety, the penetration, and the energy, they discovered in every thing he said; but those whose eye-

sight convinced them of his tender age, were confounded, as persons who were witnesses of something preternatural.

49. *At my Father's, εν τοις του πατρος μου.* E. T. *About my Father's business.* Sy. בבית אבי *in domo patris mei.* The Arm. version renders the words in the same manner. It has been justly observed, that *τα του δεινος* is a Gr. idiom, not only with classical writers, but with the sacred penmen, for denoting the house of such a person Thus, Esther vii. 9. what is in Heb. בבית המן and in the E. T. *In the house of Haman,* is rendered by the Seventy, *εν τοις Αμαν. Εις τα ιδια,* J. xix. 27. is justly translated, in the common version (and, I may add, to the same purpose, in every version I know,) *Unto his own home.* The idiom and ellipsis are the same. The like examples occur, Esth. v. 10. vi. 12. One who desires to see more, may consult Wet. upon the place. This interpretation has been given by many great sc iptural critics, ancient and modern, Origen, Euth. The. Gro. Ham. Wet. and others. As the phrase is elliptical in Gr. I have, with Dod. expressed it elliptically in Eng. It is not often that our language admits so close a resemblance.

CHAPTER III.

1. *Now, δε.* The Marcionites, who rejected the two preceding chapters, began their gospel here. It was urged by their adversaries, that the very conjunction *δε,* with which this chapter is introduced, which is translated in all the ancient versions, which was retained, it seems, by themselves, and is wanting only in two MSS. is itself an evidence of the mutilation of their copies, being always understood to imply that something preceded.

[3] *Procurator.* Diss. VIII. P. III. § 17.

2. *In the high priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas, επ' αρχιερεως Αννα και Καιαφα.* By the original constitution, one only could be high priest at one time, and the office was for life. But after the nation had fallen under the power of foreigners, great liberties were taken with this sacred office ; and high priests, though still of the pontifical family of Aaron, were put in or out arbitrarily, as suited the humour, the interest, or the political views of their rulers. And though it does not appear that they ever appointed two to officiate

jointly in that station, there is some probability that the Romans, about this time, made the office annual, and that Annas or Ananus, as he is called by the Jewish historian, and Caiaphas enjoyed it by turns. See J. xi. 49. xviii. 3. Acts iv. 6. If this was the case, which is not unlikely; or if, as some think, the *sagan*, or deputy, is comprehended under the same title, we cannot be justly surprised that they should be named as colleagues by the Evangelist. In any event it may have been usual, through courtesy, to continue to give the title to those who had ever enjoyed that dignity, which, when they had no king, was the greatest in the nation. It is not improper to add, that a very great number of MSS. many of them of the highest value, read *αρχιερεως*, in the singular. Though this reading does not well suit the syntactic order, and though it is not favoured by any ancient version, except the Cop. it is approved by Wet.

13. *Exact no more, μηδεν πλεον πρασσετε.* Vul. *Nihil amplius faciatis.* Er. *Ne quid amplius exigatis.* In this Er. who has been followed by Leo, Cas. Be. the Eng. and other modern translators, has, without departing from the known meaning of the Gr. verb, given a version that is both apposite and perspicuous. We cannot say so much of the passage, as translated in the Vul.

18. *And with many other exhortations, he published the good tidings to the people.* Diss. VI. P. V. § 4.

19. *His brother's wife, της γυναικος Φιλιππου του αδελφου αυτου.* The word *Φιλιππου* is wanting in very many MSS. both of great and of little account. It is not in some of the oldest and best editions, nor in the Vul. Arm. Go. and Sax. versions. It is, besides, rejected by Mill and Wet. The latter observes, that the name is rightly omitted here, as otherwise the person meant might readily be mistaken for the Philip mentioned v. 1. This consideration adds to the probability that he has not been named in this place, because, if the Evangelist had named him, it is natural to think, that he would have added some circumstance to discriminate him from the Philip he had mentioned so short while before.

23. *Now Jesus was himself about thirty years in subjection, και αυτος ην ὁ Ιησους 'ωσει ετων τριακοντα αρχομενος.* E. T. *And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age.* Nothing, I

think, is plainer than that, by no rule of syntax, can the Gr. words be so construed, as to yield the sense which our translators have given them. Admitting that ην αρχομενος may be used for ηρχετο; because, though the phrase does not occur in Scripture, it is not unconformable to the Gr. idiom; yet if αρχομενος mean, here, *beginning*, something still is wanting to complete the sense. Some, therefore, to fill up the deficiency, join the word ων, immediately following, to this clause, and, by an extraordinary *enallage*, cause the participle to supply the place of the infinitive. Thus, they make the Evangelist say, ην αρχομενος ων, for ηρχετο ειναι. As if we should say in Eng. *And he was beginning being*, instead of, *And he began to be*, for the expression in the one language, is no way preferable to that in the other. Those who imagine that, in so plain a case, the Evangelist would have expressed himself in so obscure, so perplexed, and so unnatural, a manner, have a notion very different from mine, of the simplicity of style employed by these writers. Besides, some critics have justly remarked, that there is an incongruity in saying, in any language, A man *began to be about* such an age. When we say, a man is about such an age, we are always understood to denote, that we cannot say whether he be exactly so, or a little more, or a little less; but this will never suit the expression, *began to be*, which admits no such latitude. To combine, in this manner, a definite with an indefinite term, confounds the meaning, and leaves the reader entirely at a loss. Some interpret the words, When he was about thirty years old, he began his ministry. But as there is no mention of ministry, or allusion to it, either in what goes before, or in what follows, I suspect this mode of expression would be equally unprecedented with the former. The whole difficulty is removed at once, by making the import of the participle the same with that of ὑποτασσομενος, ch. ii. 51. *ruled, governed, in subjection.* Hey. has adopted this method, which was, he says, suggested by a remark he found in the book called *A Critical Examination of the holy Gospels.* In this way understood, we find no more occasion to do violence to the construction; every thing like ellipsis, or tautology, or incongruous combination, vanishes at once. Besides, the meaning given is entirely analogical, and not unfrequent; αρχειν, in the active voice, is *to govern*, αρχεσθαι, in the passive, *to be governed.* Just so, αρχοντες και αρχομενοι,

magistrates and subjects. *Της νυκτος προσκοπει, τι δει ποιησουσιν οι αρχομενοι, επει· δαν ἡμερα γενηται : At night provide work for your subjects to do when it is day.* Cyropæd. lib. i. No critic hesitates to admit even an uncommon acceptation, when it is the only acceptation which suits the words connected. Who questions the propriety of rendering *πραττειν*, v. 13. *to exact?* Yet, though this verb occurs in the N. T. upwards of thirty times, the verse mentioned is the only place wherein it can be so rendered. The argument is stronger in the present case, as, by the meaning here given, which is far from being uncommon, the construction also is unravelled.

[2] *As was supposed, ως ενομιζετο.* Vul. Er. Zu. Cas. *Ut putabatur.* Sy. to the same purpose, מסחבר Hey. *As was supposed according to law.* Priestley's Harmony, *As he was by law allowed to be.* In this he has adopted the explanation given by Bishop Pearce, in his commentary and notes. I am not against preferring a less, to a more, usual interpretation, when the former suits the scope of the passage, and the latter does not. But, in the present instance, nothing can suit better the scope of the passage, than the common acceptation of the verb *νομιζεσθαι*, which is, *to be thought, supposed,* or *accounted.* The historian had, in the two preceding chapters, given us an account of our Lord's miraculous conception by the power of the Holy Spirit in the womb of a virgin. After having said so much to satisfy us that Jesus was no son of Joseph, and now introducing the mention of him as his son, it was quite natural to insert the clause, *ως ενομιζετο,* to show that, in this, he did not contradict himself, but spoke only according to the current, though mistaken opinion, of the country. But what the words, *allowed by law,* have to do here, it would not be easy to conceive. One would imagine, from them, that a claim of succession to Joseph had been made on the part of Jesus, and opposed by the relations, but carried in a court of law. This is one of those refinements in criticism, which make men nauseate what is obvious, and pursue, through the mazes of etymology, what was never imagined before. Be. who, as has been observed, often errs in this way, has not discovered, here, any scope for the indulgence of his favourite humour, but, like others, has rendered the words, simply, *ut existimabatur.* As to the quotations from Josephus, there is nothing parallel in the cases : besides, it will

readily be admitted, by critics, that the words *ευχας νενομισμενας*, are better rendered *the customary prayers*, than *the prayers appointed by law*. The passive *νομιζεσθαι* frequently corresponds to the La. *moris esse:* whereas, the proper expression in Gr. for *prayers appointed by law*, is *ευχας νομιμους*. The examples from classical authors, referred to in Wet. are all capable of being rendered by one or other of the two ordinary significations, *to be thought*, or *to be wont*. But, in such phrases as *'ως ενομιζετο*, there is commonly a meaning appropriated, by use, to the words, taken jointly, from which there will not, perhaps, be found a single exception. Had it, therefore, been the sacred writer's intention to say what those interpreters would make him say, he would certainly have chosen another expression for conveying his sentiment than this, which, he must have been sensible, could not be understood otherwise than as it has always, till so late as the eighteenth century, been interpreted; for let it be observed, that this is one of the passages in which there was never discovered, by either commentators or intrepreters, the shadow of a difficulty, and about which there was never before any difference of opinion or doubt.

36. *Son of Cainan.* Be. on the single authority of the Cam. in opposition to the united testimonies of MSS. and translations, has omitted this clause in his version. *Cainan* is not indeed in the Heb. genealogy of Abraham, Gen. xi. 12, 13. either in the Jewish copy or in the Samaritan, though it is in the version of the Seventy. But this is not the only place in which this Evangelist, who wrote in Gr. followed the old Gr. translation, even where it differed from the original Heb. But it is not the province of a translator of the Gospel, because he esteems the Heb. reading preferable to the Gr. to correct, by his own ideas, what he has reason to believe was written by the Evangelist.

CHAPTER IV.

2. *The Devil.* Diss. VI. P. I. § 1—6.

7. *It shall all be thine, εσται σου παντα.* In the much greater number of MSS. especially those of principal note, for *παντα* we read *πασα*, agreeing with *εξουσια*. Both the Sy. the Cop. the Eth.

and the Ara. versions, have read in the same manner. But the Vul. has *omnia*. Of printed editions, the Com. two of Stephens, Wechelius, Ben. Wet. Bowyer, read also *παντα*.

8. *Ὑπαγε οπισω μου Σατανα.* This clause is not only wanting in some of the best MSS. but in the Sy. Vul. Go. Sax. Cop. Arm. and Eth. translations. Gro. observes, that before The. no ancient writer considered these words as belonging to this place. Mill agrees with Gro. in rejecting them. Wet. who is more scrupulous, chooses to retain them, though he rejects the particle *γαρ* immediately following, to which the introduction of this clause has probably given rise.

18. *Inasmuch as, ὁν ἑνεκεν.* E. T. *Because.* Vul. *Propter quod.* Cas. *Quandoquidem.* Dod. and others, *For the purpose to which.* The force of the conjunction is better hit by Cas. than either by the E. T. or by the Vul. and Dod. It is neither causal nor final so much as explanatory. Such is often the import of the Heb. ען *iaghan*, the word used by the prophet.

18, 19. Diss. V. P. II. § 2. Diss. VI. P. V. § 5.

19. The Vul. without the authority of MSS. adds to this verse, *et diem retributionis ;* and in this is followed by the second Sy. Ara. Arm. and Sax. versions. A clause corresponding to it is indeed found in the prophet quoted ; but in no Gr. MS. of L. except in a few belonging to the Marquis de los Veles, which, in Si.'s opinion, have been fabricated on the Vul. and are consequently of no authority in this question.

20. *To the servant. τω ὑπηρετη.* E. T. *To the minister.* From the manner in which we apply the word *minister*, in our churches, the Eng. reader is apt to be led into a mistake by the common version, and to consider the word here as meaning the person who presided in the service ; whereas, it denotes only a subordinate officer, who attended the minister, and obeyed his orders in what concerned the more servile part of the work. Amongst other things, he had the charge of the sacred books, and delivered them to those to whom he was commanded by his superiors to give them. After the reading was over, he deposited them in their proper place. This officer the Jews call *chazan*, who ought not to be confounded with *αρχισυναγωγος, ruler of the synagogue.*

22. *All extolled him, παντες εμαρτυρουν αυτω.* E. T. *All bare him witness. Μαρτυρειν τινι* commonly denotes, *to give one a favourable testimony; to praise, to extol, to commend:* as ch. xi. 48. Acts xiii. 22. Rom. x. 2. Here it is manifestly used in this sense. The phrase *bare him witness*, is both indefinite and obscure.

[2] *Words full of grace, τοις λογοις της χαριτος.* E. T. *The gracious words.* Dod. *The graceful words.* I took notice, on ch. ii. 40. that *gracious*, which is nearly synonymous to *kind*, does not suit the sense of this passage. I must say the same thing of *graceful*, which though one who judged from etymology, would think perfectly equivalent to *full of grace*, is not so in reality. *Graceful* words means, in approved use, no more than *well-sounding* words; whereas, in *words full of grace*, if I mistake not, there is always something implied in relation to their sense much more than to their sound.

34. *The holy One of God, ὁ ἁγιος του Θεου.* For the full import of the word *ἁγιος*, in its different applications, see Diss. VI. P. IV. It may be proper here, however, to remark, that when the word is used in the N. T. as an appellative with the article, in the singular number, and applied to a person, the application is always either to God or to Christ. Let it be observed, that I do not speak of the Heb. חסיד *chasid*, and the Gr. *ὁσιος*, but of קדש *kadosh* and *ἁγιος*. This term is employed sometimes alone, to denote the true God, *ὁ ἁγιος* the holy One, and sometimes, particularly in the O. T. with the addition of the name of his people, *the holy One of Israel. Ὁ ἁγιος, the holy One*, or *the saint*, is, in like manner, appropriated, particularly in the N. T. to Jesus Christ, commonly with the addition of *του Θεου*. But, after the times of the Apostles, Christians became much more lavish of titles, and of this title in particular, than their predecessors had been. I have, therefore, chosen to follow our translators in rendering *ὁ ἁγιος the holy One*, rather than *the Saint*, a denomination which, in latter ages, has been so much prostituted, that, to say the least, a name so venerable, as that of Jesus, could derive no dignity from it.

36. *What meaneth this? that with authority and power he commandeth? τις ὁ λογος ὁυτος, ὁτι εν εξουσια και δυναμει επιτασσει;* E. T. *What a word is this? For with authority and power he*

commandeth. For the import of the conjunction *ότι*, in this place, see ch. i. 45. [2] N.

39. *Standing near her, επιστας επανω αυτης.* E. T. *He stood over her. Επανω*, in the sacred penmen, frequently answers to the Heb. עַל *ghal*, which corresponds not only to the La. preposition *super*, but to *juxta.*

40. *After sunset, all they who had any sick*—because then the Sabbath was ended, and the people were at liberty to carry their sick.

41. *Thou art the Messiah, the Son of God, συ ει ὁ Χριστος ὁ υιος του Θεου.* Vul. *Tu es filius Dei. Ὁ Χριστος* is not in the Cam. and four other MSS. It has no place in the Cop. Arm. Sax. and Ara. versions, any more than in the Vul.

[2] *Would not allow them to speak, because they knew, ουκ εια αυτα λαλειν, ότι ηδεισαν.* Some say that the words may be rendered *Would not allow them to say that they knew*, interpreting the conjunction *ότι* as in verse 36. Had the Evangelist used *λεγειν* instead of *λελειν*, I should certainly have so translated the passage; but as these two verbs are not employed promiscuously in Gr. I thought it better to preserve the distinction in Eng.

42. *Sought him out, εζητουν αυτον.* E. T. *Sought him.* A very great number of MSS. and among these some of the most valuable, read *επεζητουν.* The difference in meaning is not considerable; but it is sufficient to warrant the distinction here made.

[2] *Urged him not to leave them, κατειχον αυτον του μη πορευεσθαι απ' αυτων.* E. T. *Stayed him that he should not depart from them.* In most translations, as well as in the Eng. the words are so rendered as to imply that they detained him by force. But that *κατεχω* does not always signify the possession or the attainment of the thing spoken of, is evident from this very writer's use of it, Acts xxvii. 40. *κατειχον εις τον αιγιαλον*, which our translators render, very justly, *made toward shore.* Here the verb expresses no more than the earnestness of their endeavours.

CHAPTER V.

2. *Aground near the edge*, εστωτα παρα την λιμνην. E. T. *Standing by the lake.* The word ἑστως, applied to a ship or boat, means either being *at anchor*, or being *aground.* The latter seems here the more probable meaning, for the following reasons: First, The πλοια, so often mentioned in the Gospel, though in the common version rendered *ships*, were, in reality (if we may judge from the account given of them by Josephus, who had good occasion to know, having had for some time the chief command in Galilee,) but a sort of large fishing boats. What we are told, v. 7. that the fishes taken filled both the vessels, insomuch that they were near sinking, is a strong confirmation of what we learn from him concerning their size. I have, therefore, in this and other places, after the translators of P. R. Si. Sa. Beau. L. Cl. and other Fr. interpreters, rendered the word *barks*, distinguishing the diminutive πλοιαρια by translating it *boats.* Even the largest of such vessels might easily be run aground or set afloat, as occasion required. Josephus calls them σκαφη, reckons about two hundred and thirty of them on the lake, and four or five men to each. Another reason for thinking that the word εστωτα here means rather *aground* than *at anchor*, is, because they are said to be, not εν τη λιμνη, but παρα την λιμνην. It is the same expression which is used in the preceding verse, concerning our Lord himself, and which, by consequence, must mean beside the water, rather than in it. Thirdly, Our Lord's desire, expressed in the third verse, to put off a little from the land, when his sole purpose was to teach the people, shows that they were so close upon the multitude as to be incommoded by them. This is also another evidence of the smallness of the vessels.

7. *So that they were near sinking*, ωστε βυθιζεσθαι αυτα. E. T. *So that they began to sink.* Vul. *Ita ut pœne mergerentur.* The Sy. version is conformable to the Vul. Common sense indeed shows, that βυθιζεσαι cannot here be rigidly interpreted. In familiar language, words are often used with equal latitude.

9. *For the draught of fishes which they had taken, had filled him and all his companions with terror*, θαμβος γαρ περιεσχεν

αυτον και παντας τους συν αυτω, επι τη αγρα των ιχθυων ἡ συνελαβον. E. T. *For he was astonished, and all that were with him, at the draught of the fishes which they had taken.* The word *astonished*, in the common version, is far too weak for expressing the effect which we find this miracle produced upon Peter, and which evidently had in it more of *terror* than *astonishment*. I have, in v. 8th, varied from my ordinary method, and rendered *Κυριε*, *Lord*, though addressed to Jesus before his resurrection. I think the manner in which Peter appears to have been affected, and the extraordinary petition he presented to a person of whose benevolence and humanity he had been so oft a witness, will justify this alteration, as they clearly show that he discovered in his Master, on this occasion, something superior to human, which quite overwhelmed him with awe and fear.

10. *Thou shalt catch men*, ανθρωπους εση ζωγρων. Dod. *Thou shalt captivate men.* But *captivate* is never applied to *fishes*. Consequently, by this rendering, the trope is destroyed; for ζωγρεω is equally applicable to both. Besides, *to catch* expresses no more than an effect; and does not, of itself, imply any artifice in the means; just so ζωγρεω expresses the effect, without either implying or excluding artifice.

26. *Incredible things*, παραδοξα. E. T. *Strange things.* This expression is rather feeble. Vul. *Mirabilia.* Er. Zu. Cas. *Incredibilia.* Be. *Inopinata.* The import of the Gr. word is better hit by Er. Zu. and Cas. than by either of the other La. translators. The words used by Be. appears at first to be the most exact, because most conformable to etymology, παρα την δοξαν, but it is in fact the weakest of all, for *inopinatus* is no more than *unexpected;* now, to say a thing is unexpected, is not saying so much as it is *strange.* It may be observed in passing, that the term occurs in no other place of the N. T. and is not found in the version of the Seventy.

CHAPTER VI.

1. *On the Sabbath called second-prime*, εν Σαββατω δευτεροπρωτω. E. T. *On the second Sabbath after the first.* Vul. Er. Zu. Cas. *Sabbato secundo primo.* Among the different explanations which are given of the term δευτεροπρωτος I find nothing but con-

jecture, and therefore think it is the safest way to render the word by one similarly formed in our language. This is what all the best translators have done in La. In the Sy. there is no word answering to it. The common version has, in this instance, neither followed the letter, nor given us words which convey any determinate sense.

7. *Watched*, *παρετηρουν αυτον*. But *αυτον* is wanting in a very great number of MSS. the Al. and some others of principal note, in several of the best editions, in the Vul. Go. and Sax. versions, &c. It is rejected both by Mill and by Wet.

9. *I would ask you, What is it lawful to do on the Sabbath? Good or ill?* *Επερωτησω ὑμας τι· Εξεστι τοις Σαββασιν αγαθοποιησαι, η κακοποιησαι.* E. T. *I will ask you one thing, Is it lawful on the Sabbath to do good, or to do evil?* But a great many MSS. and printed editions, read the sentence as pointed in this manner, *Επερωτησω ὑμας· Τι εξεστι τοις Σαββασιν; αγαθοποιησαι, η κακοποιησαι;* which, without any alteration on the words or letters, yields the sense here expressed. I have had occasion to observe that, in regard to the pointing, it cannot be denied that the critic is entitled to greater freedom of conjecture than in what concerns the words themselves. To show, however, that this manner of distinguishing the clauses is very ancient, it is proper to observe that both the Sy. versions and the Go. are made from the sentence divided in the manner just now exhibited. As to the import of the question it contains see Mr. iii. 4. N.

12. *In an oratory*, *εν τη προσευχη του Θεου*. E. T. *In prayer to God.* It is plain that by the known rules of construction, the words do not admit this interpretation. The common signification of *προσευχη* is indeed *prayer;* but both *προσευχη* and *δεησις*, a term of nearly the same import, are always, in the N. T. construed with the preposition *προς* before the object addressed. See Acts xii. 5. Rom. x. 1. xv. 30. Heb. v. 7. And when either term is followed by the genitive of a word, denoting a person, it is invariably the person praying, not the person prayed to. See Jam. v.16. Rev. v. 8. viii. 3. Though the words occur in the Sep. and in the N.T. times without number, the genitive is not, in a single instance, employed to denote the being to whom supplication is made. Such a mode of interpreting would be subversive of the analogy of the language,

The only way of avoiding this error here is by assigning another meaning to the word προσευχη, and translating it *a house*, or *place of prayer, an oratory*. That there is undoubted authority for this meaning of the word, is shown by the examples produced by Wet. from Philo, Josephus, and others. L. uses it again in the same sense, Acts xvi. 13. 16. As the word, thus applied, peculiarly regarded the Jewish worship, it was as much appropriated as the word συναγωγη. In this acceptation, La. writers transferred it into their language. That line of Juvenal is well known, Sat. III.

" Ede ubi consistas, in qua te quæro proseucha."

Now, when the meaning is a house of prayer, the expression ἡ προσευχη του Θεου is analagous to ὁ οικος του Θεου, *the house of God*, and το ἱερον του Θεου, *the temple of God*. The definite article ἡ prefixed, though proper in the historian, speaking of a place known to those to whom his history was immediately addressed (for we generally say the church, where there is but one church,) it is not necessary in a translator to retain ; for, to his readers, such circumstances must rather appear indefinite. The addition of του Θεου was necessary in Gr. to prevent ambiguity, its import is implied in the word *oratory* in Eng. These oratories, according to some, were enclosures fenced with walls, but without roof, not like the synagogues, and the temple, ὁ ναος, strictly so called ; but in the open air, like the courts of the temple, which were comprehended under the general name ἱερον, and in respect of their destination, were also oratories or places of prayer. (Lewis, Orig. Heb. B. iii. Ch. 9.) Oratories were not erected in cities and villages, but in the fields, nigh some river, or in the mountains. They appear to have been more ancient than synagogues, and perhaps even than the temple.

15. *Called the zealous*, του καλουμενον ζηλωτην. E. T. *Called zelotes*. As the Sy. word *Canaanite*, used in the parallel place in Mt. is susceptible of the same interpretation with the Gr. word used here, which may be understood either as an epithet or as a surname ; and as it was not uncommon, in writing Gr. to translate the Oriental names by a word of the same import (thus Cephas is translated *Peter*, Thomas *Didymus*, Tabitha *Dorcas ;)* it is very probable that this has happened in the present case. It is the more so, as there was, about that time, a party in Palestine, who distinguished themselves by the title ζηλωται, and who though, perhaps, actuated

by a pious intention in the beginning, soon degenerated, and became at last, the greatest scourge of their country, and the immediate cause of its ruin. But, at the time referred to by the Evangelist, as they had not perpetrated those crimes with which they are charged by the historian, nay, were favoured by the people as patriots, and men who burnt with zeal for religion; I thought it better to render ζηλωτην here *the zealous*, according to the meaning of the word; as it appears to have been the intention of the writer to acquaint us that this Simon had belonged formerly to the party so denominated. I have said *the zealous*, rather than *the zealot*, as this last term is never used by us but in a bad sense. And though, indeed, the atrocious actions of the ζηλωται brought at last the very name into disgrace, there is no reason to think that the mention of it here carries any unfavourable insinuation along with it. Mt. x. 4. N.

22. *Separate you from their society*, αφορισωσιν ὑμας, that is, *Expel you from the synagogue, excommunicate you.*

[2] *Defame you*, εκβαλωσι το ονομα ὑμων ὡς τονηρον. E. T. *Cast out your name as evil.* L. Cl. Beau. *Vous diffamera.* These Fr. translators have, in my opinion, expressed the full import of this clause. The phrase הוציא שם רע *hotsia shem rang*, Deut. xxii. 19. (which corresponds to the Gr. expression above quoted) is a Heb. circumlocution for *defaming*, or raising and propagating an evil and false report. This interpretation, beside being more perspicuous, makes the words exactly coincide in sense with the parallel passage, Mt. v. 11. Now there is ground to think that the sentiment conveyed in both places is the same. For whether the Evangelists have given us two discourses, delivered at different times, or accounts a little diversified of the same discourse, the general coincidence of the sentiments is evident. It may be objected to the interpretation, here given, that there is, in one point, a dissimilarity in the expression used by Moses and that employed by L. there being nothing in the Heb. corresponding to the Gr. ὡς. But a small difference in the application of the phrases accounts entirely for this variation. In the passage quoted from the Pentateuch, there is no occasion for a pronoun; the expression is general and indefinite, *Because he hath brought up* (strictly, *set forth*) *an evil name on a virgin of Israel.*

In the Gr. of the Evangelist, the expression is definite and particular, being specially addressed to the hearers, and therefore conjoined with the pronoun of the second person. It is not *ονομα*, but *το ονομα ὑμων*, not *a name* in general, but *your name* in particular. If, therefore, *πονηρον* had followed without the *ὡς*, there would have been an implicit acknowledgment of the truth of the scandal, and their enemies would have been charged only with publishing it. As it stands, it entirely corresponds to the expression in Mt. *Accuse you falsely of every evil thing*.

24, 25, 26. *Wo unto you—Ουαι ὑμιν.* The form of expression in both languages, in these verses, so much coincides with what we are rarely accustomed to hear, except in passionate imprecations, that it is no wonder they should be, in some measure, misunderstood, by the majority of readers. That such words were often directed against those who were not only bad men, but the avowed enemies of our Lord, is a circumstance which heightens this appearance of imprecation, and renders it difficult for us to conceive otherwise of the expressions. Some have called them authoritative denunciations of judgments; but this, I am afraid, is but a softer way of expressing the same thing. Our Lord is not here acting in the character of judge, pronouncing sentence on the guilty, or dooming them to punishment. The office of judge is part of that glory to which he was not to be exalted till after his humiliation and sufferings. But he speaks here, in my apprehension, purely in the character of prophet, or teacher, divinely enlightened as to the consequences of men's actions, and whose zeal for their good obliged him to give them warning. But that this explanation may not appear merely conjectural, let the following considerations, for ascertaining the import of the interjection, be impartially attended to. The only satisfactory evidence, in such cases, is the actual application of the word. Now, as to its application in the instances before us, there are four classes against whom *woe* is pronounced. These are :—*the rich,—they that are full,—they who laugh,—they of whom men speak well.* Now, that we may apprehend more exactly the view with which they were uttered, let us consider the four classes (for they also are four,) in verses 20, 21, and 22, which are, with like solemnity, pronounced happy. These are :—*the poor,—they that hunger,—they that weep,—they of whom men speak ill.* No one can be at a loss to perceive that

these are manifestly and intentionally constrasted; the characters in the former class being no other than those of the latter reversed. And if so, by all the rules of interpretation, the mood or form of the sentence must be the same in both. Now as these *Μακαριοι οι πτωχοι, κ. τ. ε.* have ever been considered as declarative, and not as expressing a prayer or wish; the other must be understood in the same manner. The substantive verb, therefore, to be supplied (for in both cases it is, agreeably to the Hebrew idiom, wanting in the original,) is in the indicative, and not in the optative or the imperative. *Woe is unto you*, not *woe be unto you. Vox est*, says Gro. *dolentis, non ira incensi.* Again, let us consider a little the expression, Mt. xxiv. 19. in our Lord's prediction of the calamities coming on Jerusalem and the Jewish nation; *Ουαι ταις εν γαστρι εχουσαις, και ταις θηλαζουσαις εν εκειναις ταις ημεραις. Woe to the women with child, and to them that give suck in those days.* As nobody can be so foolish as to imagine that either pregnancy, or the suckling of children, are here exhibited as criminal; to understand this otherwise than as a declaration of the unhappiness of women in these circumstances, at such a time of general calamity, were absurd in an uncommon degree. The parallel passage in L. xxiii. 29. where we have the same prophecy, would remove every shadow of doubt as to the meaning, if it were possible that, to the attentive and judicious, there could be any: *The days are coming wherein they shall say, Happy the barren, the wombs which never bare, and the breasts which never gave suck.* That these words are declarative, is what no person ever called in question. If we recur to the O. T. we have the clearest proofs that the word in Heb. rendered *ουαι* in the Sep. is commonly employed to express not wrath and execration, but the deepest concern and lamentation. Accordingly we find, in several instances, the word construed with the pronoun of the first person, *ουαι ημιν*, and *ουαι μοι*, *woe unto us* and *woe unto me;* in which cases, to avoid ambiguity, our translators might have said always, as they have done in some places, *woe is us*, and *woe is me*, which, though perhaps too familiar for the solemn style of Scripture, exactly hits the sense of the original. But in those places, it must be owned, nobody seems to have mistaken the words for an imprecation. See 1 Sam. iv. 7, 8. Jer. iv. 13. vi. 4. Lam. v. 16. both in the Sep. and in the E. T. In fine, as *the*

Son of Man came not to destroy men's lives, but to save them; he came not to curse, but *to bless us, by turning away every one of us from his iniquities.* The words which proceeded out of his mouth were, in every sense, justly denominated *full of grace.* His example was perfectly conformable to his instructions; and I will venture to affirm that, the more narrowly we examine his discourses, the more we shall be convinced, that nothing he ever uttered against any living being, if candidly interpreted, will be found to bear any the least affinity to an imprecation. Wa. in his translation of Mt. renders *ουαι*, ch. xi. 21. and in other places, *alas!* Thus: *Ουαι σοι Χοραζιν* is, with him, *Alas! for thee, Chorazin!* But though he has so far hit the sense, in making this particle an interjection of pity and grief, not of anger or resentment, there is a feebleness in the expression which ill befits the importance of the occasion. It would suit well enough for expressing a transient regret on account of some trifling accident; but so slight an indication of sorrow, in a matter of such ineffable consequence as that which affects men's eternal interests, has a worse effect, and looks more like insensibility, than the absence of every outward indication. The common rendering has this advantage, that it represents the subject as serious, yea, momentous: and as the use of the idiom, in other places of the E. T. as well as in the original, puts it beyond all doubt, that it is often the voice of lamentation, and not of wrath, I thought it, on the whole, better to retain it; and, for removing every appearance of ambiguity, to give this explanation in a note.

26. *When men shall speak well of you, ὁταν καλως ὑμας ειπωσι παντες οι ανθρωποι.* The word *παντες* is wanting in many MSS. some of them of principal note; and also in the Sy. Vul. Eth. and Ara. versions, as well as in several of the best editions and ancient commentators. Mill and Wet. both reject it.

35. *Nowise despairing, μηδεν απελπιζοντες.* E. T. *Hoping for nothing again.* Vul. Er. Zu. Cas. Be. *Nihil inde sperantes.* Such a concurrence, in the La. interpreters, has ensured, as might have been expected, the imitation of all the first translators into modern European tongues; insomuch that this interpretation seems to have become, till of late, universal in the West. But from this the Sy. and Oriental versions differ considerably. I agree with Wet. and others, in rejecting it, because I see no reason for thinking that

απελπιζειν has ever, either in classical writers, or in sacred, any such meaning. This, indeed, is the only place in the N. T. where it occurs. The passive participle *απηλπισμενος*, is found once in the Sep. Is. xxix. 19. answering to a word signifying *indigent*, or, as we should say, *hopcless*. It is used, in the same sense, Judith ix. 11. The verb *απελπιζειν* occurs in three other places of the Apocryphal writings, but in none of them is susceptible of any other interpretation than to lose hope, to despond. This is also the classical sense of the word. The only reason I can discover, which has induced expositors to give it a contrary meaning, and to make it signify *to hope for something back*, seems to have been the notion that the verse, thus interpreted, makes the best contrast to the preceding words, *If ye lend to those only from whom ye hope to receive*—— I acknowledge that, in the common version, there is the appearance of a stronger contrast, than in the translation which I have given; but if it were so, this is not a sufficient reason for affixing a meaning to the word so unprecedented, especially when its ordinary acceptation suits the scope of the passage. Besides, the contrast, I suspect, is not so pointed as some imagine. *From whom ye hope to receive*, does not, in my notion, suggest the restitution of the loan, but the like good office in return. It is as if he had said, 'If ye lend to those only from whom ye yourselves may have occasion to borrow,' —— for this, it must be owned, is merely a selfish intercourse. But the very term, *to lend*, implies the stipulation of the return of what is lent (otherwise it would not be called *lent*, but *given*;) nor does this stipulation annihilate the humanity of the action in lending money, especially to a very poor man, since the lender gratuitously gives the borrower the use of his property, while he himself runs the hazard of the loss. Let it be observed that, by lending, I do not mean, here, putting out money at interest; for this is an affair merely commercial, and comes not, unless in particular circumstances, under the class of good offices. Now, had the verb *απελπιζω* been capable of the meaning which those interpreters assign to it, it would have been more apposite to subjoin *μηδεν απελπιζοντες* immediately after *αγαθοποιειτε*, leaving out *και δανειζετε* altogether for this rather hurts the sense. Again, there are some who, sensible that *απελπιζειν* does not admit the interpretation which the Vul.

has given it, and that its ordinary meaning is *to despair*, think that, by a sort of Hebraism, it may be interpreted, here, actively, to cause to despair. These make a small alteration on the preceding word, saying, μηδενα (not μεδεν) απελπιζοντες *causing none to despair*, to wit, of relief when in straits. This gives a good sense, and not unsuitable to the scope of the context. But though some neuter verbs are, in the Hellenistic idiom, sometimes active, expressing the force of the Heb. conjugation *hiphil*, we have no evidence that this ever took place in this verb ; for it cannot be affirmed, that it holds of all neuter verbs indiscriminately. Besides, there is no MS. which reads μηδενα, and there is no necessity, in the present case, for even a small deviation from the acknowledged reading, or from the ordinary acceptation of the words. In further support of the translation here given, let it be observed, that what commonly proves the greatest hindrance to our lending, particularly to needy persons, is the dread that we shall never be repaid. It is, I imagine, to prevent the influence of such an over-cautious mistrust, that our Lord here warns us not to shut our hearts against the request of a brother in difficulties. ' Lend cheerfully,' as though he had said, ' without fearing the loss of what shall be thus bestowed. It often happens that, even contrary to appearances, the loan is thankfully returned by the borrower ; but if it should not, remember (and let this silence all your doubts) that God chargeth himself with what you give from love to him, and love to your neighbour. He is the poor man's surety.' It may not be improper to add, that several La. MSS. read, agreeably to the interpretation here given, *nihil desperantes*. It is not impossible, that from *desperantes* has sprung, through the inadvertency, or haste, of some transcriber, the present reading *inde sperantes*.

37. *Release, and ye shall be released,* απολυετε και απολυθησεσθε. E. T. *Forgive, and ye shall be forgiven.* Vul. *Dimittite, et dimittemini.* Though the forgiveness of injuries is doubtless included in the precept, it ought not to be limited to this meaning. When these are specially intended, the word used by the Evangelists, particularly L. is αφιημι, not απολυω. The latter implies equally discharging from captivity, from prison, from debt. Of the like import is the La. *dimitto*.

CHAPTER VII.

5. *It was he who built*, αυτος ωκοδομησεν. E. T. *He hath built.* The pronoun αυτος is, here, evidently emphatical, being otherwise unnecessary. It is only in some such way as taken in this version, that the emphasis can be expressed in Eng. Diss. XII. P. I. § 32.

[2] *Our synagogue*, την συναγωγην ἡμιν. E. T. *Us a synagogue.* Had the expression in Gr. been συναγωγην ἡμιν, without the article, it could not have been more exactly rendered than as in the common translation; but, with the article, it evidently denotes, either that there was but one synagogue in that city, or that there was only one in which those elders were concerned. In either case, it ought to be *our synagogue.*

9. *Admired him*, εθαυμασεν αυτον. Vul. *Miratus est;* agreeably to which version the Cam. and two other MSS. omit αυτον. The Sax. also omits the pronoun.

11. *Accompanied by his disciples*, συνεπορευοντο αυτων οἱ μαθηται αυτου ἱκανοι. E. T. *Many of his disciples went with him.* But ἱκανοι is wanting in three of the principal MSS. and in the Sy. Vul. Cop. Arm. and Sax. versions, there is no word answering to it, it is, therefore, rejected by some critics.

16. *God hath visited his people*, επεσκεψατο ὁ Θεος τον λαον αυτου. But does not the Eng. *visited* sometimes mean *punished?* It does; and so does the Gr. επεσκεψατο. The distinction between the favourable, and the unfavourable meaning, is, in both languages, made easily, though solely, by the words in connexion.

29. *All the people.* I have marked this, and the following verse, as the words of Jesus. Some have, improperly, considered them as spoken by the Evangelist, acquainting us that the people who heard what Jesus said at this time, concerning John, glorified God, by an immediate recourse to John for baptism. But this cannot be the sense, for John was then as we learn from Mt. xi. 2. in prison, where he remained till his death, and so had it no longer in his pow-

er to baptize any. Besides, it was John's office to bring disciples to Jesus, whose harbinger he was, and not the office of Jesus to bring disciples to John.

[2] *Have honoured God, εδικαιωσαν τον Θεον.* E. T. *Justified God.* As this expression is obscure, some prefer, *have acknowledged the justice of God ;* which, though favoured by etymology, does not reach the meaning. *Δικαιοω* is doubtless from *δικαιος*, but does not here imply a vindication of God's justice, more than of his wisdom or goodness. This clause is a proper contrast to that which follows. As those who refused John's baptism, dishonoured God, by rejecting his counsel, those who received John's baptism, honoured God, by following his counsel.

30. *Have rejected the counsel of God with regard to themselves, την βουλην του Θεου ηθετησαν εις εαυτους.* E. T. *Rejected the counsel of God against themselves ;* meaning, doubtless, *they against themselves* (that is, *to their own prejudice.*) *rejected the counsel of God.* This sense is good, but it is ambiguously expressed in the common translation. Our translators have also given, on the margin, another version, which is preferred by several. *They rejected within themselves the counsel of God.* I think, with Gro. that of the three senses given above, the first is worthy of the preference. The preposition *εις*, often denotes *with regard to, in relation to.* The second meaning, which is that of the common version, does not naturally arise from the words. And to say, *they rejected within themselves*, seems not very apposite to what follows in the sentence, which shows that the rejection was open and notorious.

31. *Ειπε δε ὁ Κυριος.* E. T. *And the Lord said.* But in Gr. this clause is wanting in almost all the MSS. both of great and of small account. It is in neither of the Sy. versions, nor in the Ara. Eth. Cop. and Sax. In many La. MSS. also, and ancient commentaries, it is not to be found. It is omitted by some of the best editors, and rejected by Gro. Mill, Wet. and other critics. If I might indulge a conjecture, as to what has given rise to the insertion of these words, I should say, that some reader mistaking the two preceding verses for the words of the historian, has thought some such clause necessary for preventing mistakes, by showing that our Lord, in what followed, resumed the discourse. The strong evidence which we have, that this is an interpolation, proves also, in some degree,

that there was no interruption in our Lord's discourse, and that, consequently, the two preceding verses are part of it.

35. *But wisdom is justified by all her children*, και εδικαιωθη ἡ σοφια απο των τεκνων αυτης παντων. Cas. *Ita suis omnibus aliena sapientia.* This most extraordinary interpretation that author defends in a note on the parallel passage, Mt. xi. 19. The examples which he produces show, indeed, that δικαιουν sometimes means to release or deliver from evil or danger ; and to this its most common signification is nearly related. *To justify*, (which is, originally, a law term, and coincides with *to acquit*, *to absolve*,) necessarily implies deliverance from the evil of a criminal accusation, and the danger of punishment. But this is very different from the sense given, in his translation, of this verse, which is, *alienated from, averse to.* Had his rendering been *liberata*, or *soluta est sapientia*, his quotations would have been a little more to the purpose. Elsner goes still farther, and maintains that εδικαιωθη ought here to be rendered, *is condemned.* And for this signification he produces, as vouchers, Euripides and Thucydides, the purity of whose language, if that concerned the present question, will not be disputed. But it is surprising, that though δικαιουν is one of the most common verbs in the N. T. in the Gr. version of the Old, and in the Apocryphal books, written in the idiom of the synagogue, a single example has not been found in any of these to support an interpretation so foreign to the manner of the sacred writers, who confessedly, in every other instance, employ the term in a favourable meaning, and with very little difference of signification. The uniformity on this head is, indeed, so great, that it is not easy to conceive any one of them using it in a sense so contrary to its universal acceptation among them, without, at the same time, supposing him to have intended either to mislead his readers, or to express himself so as not to be understood by them. For, must he not have been sensible that, if he had intended to say *justified*, vindicated, εδικαιωθη is the very term he would have used ? We have all the reason in the world to think so from their uniform practice. Now, could any man in his senses, who seriously designed to speak intelligibly, use the same term for expressing things so opposite as *to justify*, and *to condemn* ? Was it that the language afforded no term appropriated to this last signification ? The want of proper words sometimes, no doubt, occasions

the recourse to such as are equivocal. But there was no want here; *κατακρινειν*, *καταδικαξειν*, *καταγινωσκειν*, were quite suitable, and in familiar use. To conclude; the gross impropriety of using *δικαιουν* here for *to condemn*, would have been the more glaring, as the same verb had been used in this very discourse, v. 29. (a passage to which the present bears a manifest reference) in its ordinary acceptation. I need scarcely add, that I am of the opinion of Gro. on this point, that what is called *the counsel of God*, v. 30. is here denominated, *wisdom*, and that by *her children* are not meant the wise and learned, in the world's account, such as their scribes and doctors of the law, a race remarkably arrogant and contemptuous; but the unassuming, the humble, and the pious inquirers into the will of God. This interpretation, which is the most obvious to a translator, because resulting from the most common acceptation of the words, appears to me the most perspicuous in itself, and the best suited to the scope of the discourse.

38. *Standing behind.* Diss. VIII. P. III. § 3, 4, 5, 6.

[2] *Weeping*, *κλαιουσα*. This word is wanting in one Gr. MS. and is not rendered in the Vul. nor the Sax.

45. *Since she entered*, *αφ' ης εισελθον*. E. T. *Since the time I came in.* I have, in this instance, ventured to give the preference to the reading which has the weaker support of MSS. (for they are but a few, and not the most considerable, which read *εισηλθεν*); first, on account of the authority which the most ancient and respectable translations give it; for thus the Vul. both the Sy. and the Cop. read: Secondly, because the difference in writing is so inconsiderable, that the smallest inadvertency, either in copying, or in attending to what is dictated by another, may account for it; the whole arising from the mistake of one small letter for another, the *ε* for the *ο*; Thirdly, because there is greater internal probability in the reading of the Vul. from its agreeing better with the context, which represents the woman as coming to Simon's house (v. 37.) after she had learnt that Jesus was there. Now, if Jesus was there before her, the action could be dated only from her entering, not from his. So slight a circumstance as this in the connexion is very apt to be overlooked in the hurry of transcribing, especially when the words themselves read well enough either way. But, where the dif-

ference in writing is more considerable, a reading ought not to be so easily admitted in favour of the scope of the place, against a great plurality of MSS. because, in this case, the alteration cannot be so plausibly charged on oversight.

47. *Therefore her love is great*, ὁτι ηγαπησε πολυ. E. T. *For she loved much.* Beau. *C'est pour cela qu'elle a tant aimé.* The whole context shows that the particle ὁτι is illative and not causal in this place. The parable of the debtors clearly represents the gratuitous forgiveness as the cause of the love, not the love as the cause of the forgiveness. And this, on the other hand, is, v. 50th, ascribed to her faith. This interchange of the conjunctions ὁτι and διοτι, in the scriptural idiom, has been well illustrated by Ham. Wh. and Markland. See Bowyer's conjectures.

CHAPTER VIII.

1. *Proclaiming the joyful tidings of the reign of God*, κηρυσσων και ευαγγελιζομενος την βασιλειαν του Θεου. The import of both the participles here used is fully expressed in the version; only the latter points more directly to the nature of the message, *joyful tidings*, the former to the manner of executing it, to wit, by proclamation. Diss. VI. P. V.

15. *Persevere in bringing forth fruit*, καρποφορουσιν εν ὑπομονη. E. T. *Bring forth fruit with patience.* Ὑπομονη is, in the common version, generally rendered *patience*, for the most part, feebly, and in this and some other places, improperly. *Patience*, in the ordinary acceptation, is a virtue merely passive, and consists in suffering evil with equanimity. The Gr. ὑπομονη implies much more; and, though the sense now mentioned is not excluded, it generally denotes an active quality, to wit, constancy in purpose and practice. It corresponds exactly to what is with us called *perseverance.* The word, in Scripture, which strictly answers to the Eng. term *patience*, is μακροθυμια, commonly rendered *long-suffering*, and but twice *patience.* In several such instances, when an Eng. appellative is directly formed from the La. our translators, with other moderns, have implicitly followed the Vul. which says here, *Fructum afferunt in patientia;* nor is this the only place wherein

ὑπομονη is so rendered in that translation. Now, it deserves our notice that, though the other La. interpreters have in this copied the Vul. they appear sensible that they have not expressed sufficiently the import of the original, and have therefore corrected their own version on the margin, or in the notes. Thus Be. who renders εν ὑπομονη here *cum patientia*, says, in a note, "ad verbum *cum persistentia*." Now, though *persistentia* is not a La. word, and therefore might not have been judged proper to be admitted into his translation, yet, as being formed from *persisto*, in like manner as ὑπομονη from ὑπομενω, answering to *persisto*, it can only mean *perseverance*, constancy, and ought to have been rendered *perseverantia*, which is at once classical La. and expressive of the sense, and consequently not liable to the objections which may be pleaded against either of those. Nor is Be. singular in using the word *patientia*, though sensible that it does not convey the meaning. The words in L. xxi.19. εν τη ὑπομονη κτησασθε τας ψυχας ὑμων, Cas. thus renders, both obscurely and improperly, and in no respect literally, *Vestrâ patientiâ vestræ saluti consulite*, putting on the margin, *Perseverate ad extremum, et salvi eritis*, which is a just interpretation of the Gr. and ought to have been in the text. This conduct of Cas. is the more unaccountable, as he never affects to trace the words or the construction, but seems to have it for a constant rule, overlooking every other circumstance, to express the sense of his author in classical and perspicuous La. But I can see no reason why *patientia* should be considered as a literal version of ὑπομονη, unless the custom of finding the one in the Vul. where the other is in the Gr. has served instead of a reason. Ὑπομονη is a derivative from ὑπομενω, as *patientia* from *patior*; but ὑπομενω, is never rendered *patior*, else I should have thought that an immoderate attention to etymology (which has great influence on literal translators) had given rise to it. It is, on the other hand, not to be denied, that *patience* is, in some places, the proper version of ὑπομονη; nor is it difficult, from the connexion, to discover when that term expresses the sense. For example, when it is spoken of as necessary in affliction, under temptation, or during the delay of any promised good, nobody is at a loss to discover what is the virtue recommended. But where there is nothing in the context to limit it in this manner,

it ought to be rendered by some such word as *perseverance, continuance, constancy ;* and, considering the ordinary import of the verb *ὑπομενω*, this may be called a more literal, because a more analogical, as well as a more exact, interpretation than the other. The impropriety of the common rendering is, in some places, manifest. How awkwardly is *δι' ὑπομονης τρεχωμεν* (Heb. xii. 3.) represented by *Let us run with patience ?* So passive a quality as patience is ill adapted to express the unintermitted activity exerted in running. Better, *Let us run without intermission.* And to produce but one other example from the same epistle, x. 36. *Ὑπομονης γαρ εχετε χρειαν, ινα το θελημα του Θεου ποιησαντες, κομισησθε την επαγγελιαν*, which, in the common version, runs thus, *For ye have need of patience, that, after ye have done the will of God, ye may receive the promise.* Here not only is the expression weak and obscure, but the sentiment is different. It must be owned, however, that this rendering of *ὑπομονη* is not the only thing exceptionable in the translation of the sentence. *Χρεια*, in such phrases, generally implies more than is denoted by our word *need*, or by the La. word *opus*. It expresses not only what is useful, but what is necessary, what cannot be dispensed with. For this reason, I prefer the expression of the Vul. *Patientia enim vobis necessaria est*, to that of Be. *Nam patiente animo vobis est opus.* Another error is in the rendering *επαγγελια* in this place *promise*, and not *promised reward*, agreeably to a very common Heb. idiom. The sense evidently is, *For ye must persevere in doing the will of God, that ye may obtain the promised reward.*

26. *Gadarenes, Γαδαρηνων.* Vul. *Gerasenorem.* The only vouchers the Cam. MS. and Sax. version. Mt. viii. 28. N.

27. *A man of the city, ανηρ τις εκ της πολεως.* The import of which is evidently here, 'a man belonging to the city,' not 'a man coming from the city.' The Vul. says simply, *vir quidam*, but has nothing to answer to *εκ της πολεως*. In this it is followed by the Sax. only.

[2] *Demons, δαιμονια.* Vul. *Dæmonium.* As in this diversity also, the Vul. has no support from either MSS. or versions, it is enough to mention it.

31. *The abyss, την αβυσσον.* E. T. *The deep.* The meaning of this word in Eng. is invariably *the sea.* In this sense it occurs

often in Scripture. We find it in this Gospel, ch. v. 4. where the Gr. word rendered *the deep* is το βαθος. That the sea is not meant here is evident; for to the sea the demons went of themselves, when permitted, at their own request, to enter into the swine. For the proper import of the word *abyss*, in the Jewish use, see Diss. VI. P. II. § 14.

34. *Fled, and spread the news*, εφυγον και απελθοντες απηγγειλαν. E. T. *Fled, and went and told.* But the word απηλθοντες, answering to *went*, is wanting in almost all the MSS. of any account, in the Vul. both the Sy. the Go. the Sax. Cop. and Ara. versions, in some of the most eminent editions, and is generally rejected by critics.

36. *In what manner the demoniac had been delivered*, πως εσωθη ὁ δαιμονισθεις. Vul. *Quomodo sanus factus esset a legione.* This reading appears to be equally unsupported with the two former.

41. *A ruler of the synagogue*—to wit, of Capernaum.

47. *Having thrown herself prostrate, declared to him, before all the people, why she had touched him*, προσπεσουσα αυτω δι' ἡν αιτιαν ἡψατω αυτου, απηγγειλεν αυτω, ενωπιον παντος του λαου. E. T. *Falling down before him, she declared unto him, before all the people, for what cause she had touched him.* As the second αυτω is not found in several MSS. some of them of note; as there is nothing which corresponds to it in these ancient translations, the Vul. the Sy. the Sax. and the Cop. and as it seems rather superfluous, I have omitted it in this version, taking the first αυτω to be governed by the verb απηγγειλεν.

48. *Take courage*, θαρσει. This word is wanting in the Cam. and three other MSS. and there is nothing corresponding to it in the Vul. Sax. and Cop. versions.

51. *Being come to the house*, εισελθων δε εις την οικιαν. E. T. *And when he came into the house.* But the greater number of MSS. especially those of principal note, read ελθων simply. This has also been read by the authors of the Vul. of both the Sy. the Ara. the Go. and the Sax. versions. It is in some of the best editions, and is approved by Mill and Wet. The other reading seems not quite consistent with the following part of the verse.

2 *Peter, and John, and James.* E. T. *Peter, and James, and John.* The copies, evangelistaries, La. MSS. editions, and versions, which, in exhibiting these names, follow the first order, both out-number and out-weigh those which follow the second. I acknowledge that it is a matter of very little consequence which of the two has been the original order; but as the arrangement here adopted is peculiar to this Evangelist (for it occurs again, ch. ix. 28.; whereas both Mt. and Mr. say always *James and John*), I thought it safer, where possible, to preserve the peculiarities of each, even in the smallest matters.

54. *Having made them all retire,* εκβαλων εξω παντας. These words are not in the Cam. and two other MSS. The clause is wanting also in the Vul. the Sax. and the Eth. versions.

CHAPTER IX.

1. *The twelve,* τους δωδεκα μαθητας αυτου. E. T. *His twelve disciples.* The words μαθητας αυτου are wanting in a very great number of MSS. some of them of chief note, and in several of the oldest editions. They are not in the first Sy. nor in some modern versions, as Lu.'s and the Tigurine. It is to be observed, that even the other ancient versions, the Vul. the second Sy. the Go. the Sax. the Cop. have not read μαθητας, but αποστολους. This reading is also favoured by a few Gr. MSS. of little account. When the evidence of these different readings is compared together, the superiority is manifestly for the rejection of the two words. They are, besides, quite unnecessary.

3. *Nor staves,* μητε ραβδους. Vul. *Neque virgam.* In this reading the Vul. has the sanction of a good number of MSS. and of the Sy. Eth. and Ara. versions. The balance, however, is against it.

4. *Continue in whatever house ye are received into, until ye leave the place,* εις ην αν οικιαν εισελθητε, εκει μενετε, και εκειθεν εξερχεσθε. E.T. *Whatsoever house ye enter into, there abide, and thence depart.* This way of rendering, though it appears to be literal, is very unintelligible, and conveys no determinate meaning. It seems even to be self-contradictory. Vul. *In quamcunque*

domum intraveritis, ibi manete, et inde non exeatis. There can be no doubt that the authors of this version have read μη before εξερχεσθε ; which is, indeed, found in one MS. but has no other authority that I know. The authors of the Sax. and the Cop. versions, seem, instead of the clause, και εκειθεν εξερχεσθε, to have read έως αν εξελθητε. We may, indeed, say with truth that, whether they read so or not, it was impossible, in a consistency with the scope and connexion, to render the sentence otherwise than they have done. The parallel places in like manner confirm the opinion that this must be the sense of the expression.

23. *Daily*, καθ' ἡμεραν. These words are wanting in so many and so considerable MSS. and are found in so many others, as might make one justly hesitate whether to retain or to reject them. All the ancient versions, however, except the second Sy. favour their admission ; and even that version does not exclude them ; it receives them only with a mark as dubious. There is nothing, indeed, corresponding to them in the two parallel passages of the other Gospels ; but that is no objection, as there is nothing in either, which, in the smallest degree, contradicts them ; and it is common, in the different Evangelists, to supply circumstances overlooked by the others. Besides, there is nothing in them unsuitable to the sense. As to follow Christ is the constant or daily business of his disciple, every attendant circumstance must share in that constancy. Upon the whole, the word *daily* possesses a place in the E. T. and we can say at least, that there does not appear ground sufficient for dispossessing it. Diss. XII. P. II. § 15.

28. *Εγενετο δε—και παραλαβων—* This is a mode of construction not unusual with this Evangelist. The και is redundant, as in ch. viii. 1. x. 38. and xxiii. 44. or it may be rendered into Eng. by the conjunction *that*. *It happened that :* ὡδει ἡμεραι οκτω may, doubtless, as Elsner proposes, be included in a parenthesis.

31. *The departure*, την εξοδον. E T. *The decease.* Though some have put a different meaning upon the words, it was, doubtless, our Lord's *death* which was the subject of their discourse. It must, at the same time, be acknowledged, that the word εξοδος does not necessarily imply this, it being the term by which the departure of the Israelites from Egypt was commonly expressed, and the name given by the Seventy to the second book of Moses.

As it may not have been without design, that the common names for *death*, θανατος and τελευτη, were avoided by the Evangelist, I thought it better to use here the word *departure*, which is of equal latitude with that of the original.

34. *And the disciples feared, when those men entered the cloud,* εφοβηθησαν δε εν τω εκεινους εισελθειν εις την νεφελην. E. T. *And they feared, as they entered into the cloud.* This expression evidently implies that they were the same persons who feared, and who entered into the cloud. The Gr. not less evidently, by means of the pronoun εκεινους, implies that they were different persons. I know not how I had overlooked this circumstance, till it was pointed out by Dr. Symonds. Diss. XII. P. I. § 81.

45. *It was veiled to them that they might not apprehend it,* ην παρακεκαλυμμενον απ' αυτων, ινα μη αισθωνται αυτο. E. T. *It was hid from them, that they perceived it not.* The words are susceptible of either interpretation; for though the common signification of ινα is *to the end that*, yet, in the N. T. it frequently denotes no more than *so that*. Here, however, the former clause appears to me so strongly expressed, as to justify the translation I have given of both. If the historian had employed an adjective, as αφανης, or κρυπτος, and not the passive participle of an active verb, παρακεκαλυμμενον the conjunction might, with greater probability, have been interpreted *so that*. But, as it stands, it seems to express something intentional. Nor let it be imagined that this criticism is a mere refinement. Who would not be sensible of the difference, in Eng. between saying that an expression is *dark*, and saying that it has been *darkened*, or made dark? Now this is very similar to the case in hand. Allow me to add, that there is no impropriety in supposing that predictions were intentionally expressed so as not to be perfectly understood at the time; but so as to make an impression, which would secure their being remembered till the accomplishment should dispel every doubt. Diss. XII. P. II. § 11 and 12.

48. *He who is least among you all, shall be greatest,* ὁ μικροτερος εν τασιν υμιν υπαρχων ουτος εσται μεγας. Vul. *Qui minor est inter vos omnes, hic major est.* E. T. *He that is least among you all, the same shall be great.* By a very common Hebraism, the positive supplies the place, sometimes of the comparative, sometimes of the superlative. Thus, Gen. i. 16. *God made*

two great lights, the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night. So the words are rendered in the Eng. Bible. In Heb. it is *the great light* and *the little light.* In the version of the Seventy, the former clause is expressed thus, *τον φωστηρα τον μεγαν εις αρχας της ήμερας.* Again, Mt. xxii. 36. *Which is the greatest commandment in the law? ποια εντολη μεγαλη εν τω νομω;* And, in regard to the passage now under examination, as the contention among the disciples was, which of them should be *the greatest* (for, doubtless, they expected that they should all be *great*), there can be no reasonable doubt about the import of the term.

50. *Whoever is not against us, is for us, ός ουκ εστι καθ' ήμων υπερ ήμων εστιν.* A considerable number of MSS. and some of principal note, read *ύμων* in both places. It is in this way rendered by the Vul. both the Sy. Go. Sax. Eth. and Ara. versions. But, though this should be thought to render the true reading doubtful, one thing is clear, that the difference does not affect the sense.

51. *As the time of his removal approached, εγενετο δε εν τω συμπληρουσθαι τας ήμερας της αναληψεως αυτου.* E. T. *And it came to pass, when the time was come that he should be received up. Αναληψις* does not occur in any other place of the N. T.; nor is it found in the Sep.; but being derived from *αναλαμβανω*, which is used pretty often in both, we can hardly be at a loss about the signification. The verb admits a good deal of latitude; for though it is sometimes, in the passive voice, applied to our Saviour's assumption into heaven, and signifies to be taken up; it is not confined, in the N. T. to that meaning, and has but rarely such an acceptation in the Gr. of the Seventy. The old La. translator, who renders *αναληψις*, here, *assumptio*, has probably meant this; and to this effect our Eng. translators have, still more explicitly, rendered *τας ημερας της αναληψεως αυτου, the time that he should be received up.* Yet, to me, it appears very improbable that the Evangelist should speak of the time of his ascension as being come, or just at hand, not only before his resurrection, but even before his trial and death; especially, considering that he continued no fewer than forty days on the earth after he was risen. The word *αναληψις* is equally applicable to any other method of removing. Accordingly, some Fr. trans-

lators, even from the Vul. have understood the *dies assumptionis ejus* of his death. Both in the P. R. version, and in Sa.'s, it is rendered, *Le tems auquel il devoit etre énlevé du monde.* From these Si. differs, only in saying,——*de ce monde.* But though this probably expresses the meaning, yet, as it is more explicit than the words of the Evangelist, I have preferred a simpler manner, and used a term of nearly the same extent of signification with the Gr. The word *συμπληρουσθαι*, in strictness, denotes that the time *was come.* But we all know that, in popular language, a time is often said to be come which is very near. Besides, whatever be *the removal* alluded to, the circumstances closely connected with it, or introductory to it, may well be understood as comprehended. This seems strongly indicated here, by the indefinite turn of the expression, *τας ήμερας, the days, της αναληψεως αυτου*; whereas the actual removal, whether by death, or by ascension, occupied but a small part of one day.

52. *A village, κωμην.* Vul. *Civitatem.* A few inconsiderable MSS. with The. read *πολιν.*

54. *As Elijah did, ὡς και Ηλιας εποιησε.* This clause is wanting in two MSS. and in the Vul. and Sax. versions.

62. *No man who, having put his hand to the plough, looketh behind him; is fit for the kingdom of God.* The first member of this sentence is no more than a proverbial expression for a certain character, one, to wit, who, whilst he is engaged in a work of importance, allows his attention to be distracted by things foreign. The import is that those of this description were unfit for that spiritual service in which the disciples of Jesus were to be employed. There is an implicit comparison couched in the words, but not formally proposed, as in the parables.

CHAPTER X.

1. *Seventy others, ἑτερους ἑβδομηκοντα.* E. T. *Other Seventy.* But this expression implies that there were seventy sent before. Now, this is not the fact (those sent before being no more than twelve), nor is it implied in the Gr. So inconsiderable a difference in the words makes a great alteration in the sense.

[2] *Seventy, εβδομηκοντα.* Vul. *Septuaginta duos.* Thus also the Sax. The Vat. the Cam. and one other MS. read $o\beta$, which is the numeral mark for 72.

4. *Salute no person by the way ;*—Let not matters of mere compliment detain you.

6. *If a son of peace be there, εαν μεν η εκει ὁ υιος ειρηνης.* E. T. *If the son of peace be there.* The article before *υιος* is wanting in many MSS. some of them of great name, in all the best editions, and in the comments of several Fathers. As to ancient versions, this is one of those particulars, about which we cannot safely determine, whether they read the one way or the other. Neither the Sy. nor the La. has articles ; and those languages which have them do not perfectly coincide with one another in the use of them. In the present case, the scope of the passage clearly shows that the word is used indefinitely. *Son of peace*, here, is equivalent to *worthy* in the parallel passage in Mt. The import, therefore, is, manifestly, ' If a person of worth, or deserving your good ' wishes, be there.'

17. *The Seventy.* The Cam. MS. the Vul. and the Sax. make them *seventy-two*, as in v. 1.

20. *Rejoice, χαιρετε.* The word *μαλλον, rather*, which is in the common edition, is wanting in almost all the MSS. editions versions, *&c.* of any consideration, and is, therefore, justly rejected by critics.

21. *In spirit, τω πνευματι.* The Cam. and five others, prefix *ἁγιω.* The Vul. both the Sy. the Cop. Arm. Eth. and Sax. read so.

23. *Apart, και' ιδιαν.* This is wanting in the Cam. and is not rendered in the Vul. nor in the Sax. There is no other authority, that I know, for the omission.

30. *A man of Jerusalem travelling to Jericho, ανθρωπος τις κατεβαινεν απο Ἱερουσαλημ εις Ἱεριχω.* E. T. *A certain man went down from Jerusalem to Jericho.* It cannot be denied that this is a close translation of the words as they lie ; and that, in the version here adopted, there is greater freedom taken with the arrangement. But, in my opinion, it is not greater than the scope of the place, and the practice of the sacred writers, will warrant. As to the scope of the passage, every body perceives

that it is the intention of this parable to confound those malignant Jewish prejudices, which made them confine their charity to those of their own nation and religion. Nor could any thing be better adapted for the purpose than this story, which, as it is universally understood, exhibits a Samaritan overlooking all national and religious differences, and doing offices of kindness and humanity to a Jew in distress. By this means, the narrow-minded Pharisee, who put the question, is surprised into a conviction, that there is something amiable, and even divine, in surmounting all partial considerations, and listening to the voice of nature, which is the voice of God, in giving relief to the unhappy. Now, the whole energy of the story depends on this circumstance, that the person, who received the charitable aid, was a Jew, and the person who gave it a Samaritan. Yet, if we do not transpose the *κατεβαινεν*, in this verse, and make it follow, instead of preceding, *απο Ιερουσαλημ*, we shall be apt to lose sight of the principal view. The use of *απο*, for denoting the place to which a person belonged, is common : *Ανθρωπος απο Αριμαθειας*, Mt. xxvii. 57. *Λαζαρος απο Βηθανιας*, J. xi. 1. As to the transposition, instances much greater than the present, have been taken notice of already ; and other instances will occur in these notes. Mt. xv. 1. N. See Bowyer's conjectures.

32. *Likewise a Levite on the road, when he came near the place, and saw him, passed by on the farther side, ὁμοιως δε και λευιτης, γενομενος κατα τον τοπον, ελθων, και ιδων, αντιπαρηλθεν.* E. T. *And likewise a Levite, when he was at the place, came and looked on him, and passed by on the other side.* There are some strange inaccuracies in this version. It may be asked, Whither did the Levite come, when he was already at the place ? Or, how does this coming and looking on the wounded man, consist with his passing by on the other side ? Indeed, the word *ελθων*, in the original, appears redundant, and is wanting in a few MSS. as well as in the Vul. The word *ιδων*, is badly rendered *looked on.* A man is often passive, in seeing what he does not choose to see, if he could avoid it. But *to look on* implies activity and attention. I have, in this version, expressed the sense, without attaching myself servilely to the words. In rendering *αντιπαρηλθεν*, I have preferred Be.'s *ex adverso præteriit*, to the *pertransivit* of the Vul. It appears to me, that it is not without design that this unusual

compound, *αντιπαρερχεσθαι*, applied to the priest and the Levite, is here contrasted to the *προσερχεσθαι*, applied to the Samaritan. This is the more probable, as it is solely in this place that the former verb occurs in Scripture; whereas *παρερχεσθαι* occurs frequently in the sacred writers, and in none oftener than in this Evangelist, as signifying to pass on, to pass by, or pass away. Add to all, that this meaning of the preposition *αντι*, in compound verbs, is common, and the interpretation analogical. Besides, the circumstance suggested is not only suitable to the whole spirit of the parable, but natural and picturesque.

34. *Πανδοχειον*. ch. ii. 7. [2] N.

35. *When he was going away, εξελθων*. This word is wanting in the Cam. and three other MSS. and is not rendered in the Vul. Sy. Eth. Sax. and Ara. versions.

42. *The good part*. I had in the former edition, after the E. T. said *that good part*. It has been remarked to me, by a friend, that the pronoun seems to make the expression refer to the *one thing necessary*. I am sensible of the justness of the remark, and therefore now, literally follow the Gr. *την αγαθην μεριδα*.

CHAPTER XI.

2. 4. The words, in these verses, inclosed in crotchets, have nothing in the Vul. corresponding to them, nor in the Arm. version. They are wanting also in several MSS. Some of the Fathers have given what I may call, a negative testimony against their admission, by omitting them in those places of their works where we should have expected to find them; but Origen's testimony against them is more positive: for he says, expressly, of some of those clauses and petitions, that they are in Mt. but not in L. It deserves to be remarked, also, that he does not say (though in these matters he is wont to be accurate) that those expressions are not found in many copies of L.'s gospel, but simply, that L. has them not. This would lead one to think, that he had not found them in any transcript of that Gospel which had come under his notice, though far the most eminent scriptural critic of his time; and that they were, consequently,

an interpolation of a later date. Whatever be in this, some of our best modern critics, Gro. Ben. Mill, and Wet. seem to be agreed that, in this place, we are indebted for them to some bold transcribers, who have considered it as a necessary correction, to supply what they thought deficient in one Gospel out of another. See the notes on Mt. vi. 10, &c.

3. *Each day, το καθ' ἡμεραν.* Instead of this, the Cam. and six other MSS. read σημερον. Thus, the author of the Vul. has read, who says *hodie.* This is also followed by the Sax. version. Yet, in no other part of this prayer does that version follow the Vul. but the Gr.

6. *Off his road. εξ ὁδου.* E. T. *In his journey.* The translation, here given, is evidently closer; besides, it strengthens the argument.

7. *I and my children are in bed, τα παιδια μου, μετ' εμου, εις την κοιτην εισιν.* E. T. *My children are with me in bed.* That *μετ' εμου* does not necessarily imply that he and his children were in the same bed, but only that the children were gone to bed as well as he, has been shown by many critics. I shall, therefore, only refer the Gr. student to the following, amongst other passages which might be quoted, wherein, if he look into the original, he will find that the prepositions, *μετα* and σvν, often denote no more than the former of these, in the interpretation above given, denotes here, Mt. ii. 3. 1 Cor. xvi. 11. Eph. iii. 18.

8. *If the other continue knocking.* Vul. *Si ille perseveraverit pulsans.* Words corresponding to these are not found either in the Gr. or in the Sy. Nor can we plead the authority of MSS. The best argument in their favour is, that they seem necessary to the sense; for a man could not be said to be importunate, for having asked a favour only once. As the passage, therefore, needed the aid of some words, and as these are adapted to the purpose, and have been long in possession; for the old Itc. and the Sax. versions read so, as well as the Vul. I thought it better to retain them, adding the mark by which I distinguish words inserted for the sake of perspicuity, from those of the inspired penmen.

13. *How much more will your Father give from heaven, ποσω μαλλον ὁ πατηρ ὁ εξ ουρανου δωσει.* E. T. *How much more shall*

your heavenly Father give. Vul. *Quanto magis Pater vester de cœlo dabit.* Thus we read in the edition authorized by Pope Sixtus Quintus; whereas, after Pope Clement's corrections, it is *pater cœlestis;* but in three old editions, one published at Venice in 1484, another at Paris in 1504, the third at Lyons in 1512, we have both readings conjoined, *Pater vester cœlestis de cœlo dabit*, with a note on the margin of the last, insinuating that some copies have not the word *cœlestis.* The Sy. reads exactly as the Vul. of Sixtus Quintus. So do also the Cop. and the Sax. Some Gr. MSS. likewise omit the ὁ, and read ὑμων after πατηρ. This makes the most natural expression, and appears to have been the reading of the most ancient translators. Gro. and some other critics, have thought that πατηρ ὁ ἐξ ουρανου, is equivalent to πατηρ ὁ ἐν τω ουρανω, or ἐν τοις ουρανοις. I can find no evidence of this opinion. Such a periphrasis for God, in this or any other sacred writer, is without example; and the expressions which have been produced, as similar, are not apposite. I see no reason for imputing so strange an affectation to the Evangelist. I have, therefore, followed the Sy. which differs in nothing from the common Gr. except in reading ὑμων after πατηρ, instead of ὁ.

[2] *The holy Spirit*, πνευμα ἁγιον. Vul. *Spiritum bonum.* The Cam. αγαθον δωμα, three others, πνευμα αγαθον, agreeably to the Vul. Eth. Sax. and Arm. versions.

17. *One family falling after another*, και οικος επι οικον πιπτει. E. T. *And a house divided against a house falleth.* Vul. *Et domus supra domum cadit.* Er. and Cas. to the same purpose. Our translators have, by following Be. imperfectly, been drawn into the hardly intelligible version they have given of this passage. Be. says, *Et domus adversus sese dissidens cadit.* This translation is founded on the parallel passages in Mt. and Mr.; for nobody could have so translated the words of L. who had not recurred to the other historians. Now, though this method is often convenient, and sometimes necessary, it should not be used when the words, as they lie, are not obscure, but yield a meaning which is both just and apposite. Besides, the construction observed throughout the whole passage, and even in the parallel places, renders it probable, if not certain, that if the Evangelist's meaning had been the same with Be's. he would have said, οικος εφ ἑαυτον, which, though elliptical, might possibly, by one who had read no other Gospel, have been

apprehended to convey that sense. In the way it is expressed, it could never have been so understood by any body.

21. *The strong one, ὁ ἰσχυρος.* E. T. *A strong man.* With most interpreters, I had considered this verse as including a comparison to what usually befals housebreakers. But, on further reflection, observing that the *ἰσχυρος* is accompanied with the article, both here and in the parallel passages in Mt. and Mr. and that, as to this, there is no diversity of reading in any of the Gospels, I could not help concluding that *ὁ ἰσχυρος*, like *ὁ πονηρος, ὁ αντιδικος, ὁ διαβολος*, is intended to indicate one individual being. The connexion leads us to apply it to Beelzebub, styled in this passage *the prince of the demons.* Now, in mere similitudes, the thing to which the subject is compared, has no article. Thus Mt. xiii. 45. —*like a merchantman*, &c. 52.—*like a householder*, &c. xxii. 2. —*like a king*, &c. They are expressed indefinitely in Gr. as in Eng. Of our late Eng. interpreters who render *ὁ ισχυρος* properly, are Hey. Wes. and Wy. So also does Wa. in the parallel place in Mt.

22. *He who is stronger, ὁ ἰσχυροτερος αυτου.* E. T. *A stronger than he.* As the comparative here, likewise, has the article, nothing in the expression implies that there is more than one stronger; whereas the indefinite Eng. article seems rather to imply it. Yet of the three who had done justice to the emphasis in the former verse, Wes. is the only interpreter who has done it also in this.

29. He said, *ηρξατο λεγειν.* Mr. V. 17. N.

36. *By its flame, τη αστραπη.* Such is the import of the Gr. word in this place. It is oftenest applied to *lightning*, but not limited to that meaning.

38. *But the Pharisee was surprised to observe that he used no washing before dinner, ὁ δε φαρισαιος ιδων εθαυμασεν, ὁτι ου πρωτον εβαπτισθη προ του αριστου.* Vul. *Pharisæus autem cœpit intra se reputans dicere, quare non baptizatus esset ante prandium.* Agreeably to this version, the Cam. instead of *ιδων εθαυμασεν, ὁτι*, says, *ηρξατο διακρινομενος εν εαυτω λεγειν διοτι.* But in this it appears to be single.

39. *Malevolence*, πονηριας. Vul. *Iniquitate.* The Sax. to the same purpose. Tertullian adv. Marcion. iv. 27, says *Iniquitate*, probably from the old Itc. This seems to suggest that the interpreter had read ανομιας. But I have not heard of any example of this reading in the Gr. MSS.

41. *Only give in alms what ye have*, πλην τα ενοντα δοτε ελεημοσυνην. E. T. *But rather give alms of such things as ye have.* Τα ενοντα, *quæ penes aliquem sunt*, what a man is possessed of: δοτε τα ενοντα and δοτε εκ των ενοντων, are not synonymous. The latter expressly commands to give a part; the former does not expressly command to give the whole, but does not exclude that sense. The words, in the E. T. are an unexceptionable version of the latter. Τα υπαρχοντα (ch. xii. 33,) has nearly the same meaning with τα ενοντα here. Our Lord, in discoursing on this topic, took a two-fold view of the subject, both tending to the same end. The first and subordinate view was, that the cleanness of the inside of vessels is of as much consequence, at least, as that of the outside; the second and principal view was, that moral cleanness, or purity of mind, is much more important than ceremonial cleanness, resulting from frequent washings. These views are sometimes blended in the discourse. Under the metaphor of vessels, human beings are represented, whereof the body answers to that which is without, the soul to that which is within. Body and soul, argues our Lord, had both the same author, and the one, especially the more ignoble part, ought not to engross our regards, to the neglect of the more noble: and even as to the vessels, the genuine way of cleansing them, in a moral and spiritual sense, is by making them the instruments of conveying relief to the distressed and needy.

44. *Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites*, γραμματεις και φαρισαιοι, υποκριται. We have no translation of these words in the Vul. Cop. and Arm. versions. They are wanting also in four MSS. The Cam. has them; as also the Sax version; whence I think it probable that they were in the Itc. version.

47, &c. *Woe unto you, because ye build*——We are not to understand this, as though any part of the guilt lay in building or adorning the tombs of the Prophets, considered in itself; but in their falseness, in giving this testimony of respect to the Prophets, whilst they were actuated by the spirit, and following the exam-

ple of their persecutors and murderers; insomuch that they appeared to erect those sepulchres, not to do honour to God's Prophets, but to serve as eternal monuments of the success of their progenitors in destroying them.

54. *Laying snares for him, in order to draw——* *ενεδρευοντες αυτον και ζητουντες θηρευσαι.* E. T. *Laying wait for him, and seeking to catch——* But the copulative *και*, which makes all the difference in meaning between these two Eng. versions, is wanting in so great a number of MSS. amongst which are those of principal note, in so many editions, versions, &c. that it is justly rejected by Mill, Wet. and other critics.

CHAPTER XII.

5. *Into hell,* *εις την γεενναν.* Diss. VI. P. II. § 1.

15. *For in whatever affluence a man be, his life dependeth not on his possessions,* *ὁτι ουκ εν τω περισσευειν τινι ἡ ζωη αυτου εστιν εκ των ὑπαρχοντων αυτου.* E. T. *For a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth.* Vul. *Quia non in abundantia cujusquam vita ejus est ex his quæ possidet.* Maldonat's observation on this passage is well founded, "Difficiliora sunt verba quam sensus." All interpreters are agreed about the meaning, however much they differ about the construction. The E. T. without keeping close to the words, has expressed the sense rather more obscurely than either the Gr. or the La. The two clauses in the Gr. are in that version, combined into one; and *εστιν εκ* seems to be rendered *consisteth in.* The translators of P. R. appears to be the first who have expressed the meaning perspicuously in modern language, *Car en quelque abondance qu'un homme soit, sa vie ne depend point des biens qu'il possede.* In this they have been followed by subsequent interpreters.

25. *Besides, which of you can, by his anxiety, prolong his life one hour?* *τις δε εξ ὑμων μεριμνων δυναται προσθειναι επι την ἡλικιαν αυτου πηχυν ἑνα.* E.T. *And which of you, with taking thought, can add to his stature one cubit?* *Ἡλικια* signifies both *stature,* and *age* or *lifetime.* For examples of the latter acceptation, see

Job, ix. 21. 23. Heb. xi. 11. In every case, therefore, the words ought to be rendered by the one or other of these terms which best suits the context. Πηχυς is properly a measure of length, and may, on that account, be thought inapplicable to time. But let it be observed, that few tropes are more familiar than those wherein such measures are applied to the age or life of man. *Behold*, says the Psalmist, *thou hast made my days an hand-breadth*, Ps. xxxix. 5. Ιδου, παλαιστας εθου τας ἡμερας μου. The common version says *as an hand-breadth ;* but the word *as* is supplied by the interpreters, and has nothing corresponding to it either in the Heb. or in the Gr. Ham. has quoted from Mimnermus, an ancient poet, the phrase πηχυϊον επι χρονον, literally *for a cubit of time*, that is, for a very short time. Analogous to this is the common comparison of life to a race, or to a journey. This may suffice to show, that there is no violence done to the words of the Evangelist, in making them relate to a man's age, or term of life, and not to his stature. But whether they actually relate to the one or to the other, is best determined from the context. It is evident, that the warnings which our Lord gives here, and in the parallel passage in Mt. against anxiety, particularly regard the two essential articles of food and raiment, which engross the attention of the much greater part of mankind. Food is necessary for the preservation of life, and raiment for the protection of our bodies from the injuries of the weather. Anxiety about food is, therefore, closely connected with anxiety about life ; but, except in children, or very young persons, who must have been an inconsiderable part of Christ's audience, has no connexion with anxiety about stature. Accordingly, it is the preservation of life, and the protection of the body, which our Lord himself points to, as the ultimate aim of all those perplexing cares. *Is not life*, says he, *a greater gift than food, and the body than raiment ?* And if so, will not God, who gave the greater gift, life, give also food, which, though a smaller gift, is necessary for supporting the other ? In like manner, will not he who gave the body, give the raiment necessary for its defence ? All this is entirely consequential, and our Lord, in these warnings, touches what occupies the daily reflections and labour of more than nine-tenths of mankind. But, in what is said about stature, if we understand the word so, he appears to start aside from what employs the time and attention of the people in

every age and country, to what could be an object only to children, and a very few foolish young persons. Besides, the increase of the body, by such an addition to the stature, so far from diminishmen's anxiety, would augment it, by increasing their need both of food and of raiment. In the verse immediately following, we have an additional evidence that the word is employed here metaphorically, and that the discourse still concerns the same subject, food and raiment, or the preservation of life, and the accommodation of the body. *If ye cannot*, says he, *thus effect, even the smallest thing*, ελαχιστον, *why are ye anxious about the rest?* In respect of stature, would a cubit be called the smallest thing, which is more than one fourth of the whole? This would have been more suitable, if the word had been *an inch*. In every view, therefore, that we take of the matter, it is extremely improbable that there is here any mention of stature. The idea is foreign to the scope of the discourse; the thing said is ill-suited to the words connected with it, and ill-adapted to the hearers, as it proceeds on the hypothesis, that a sort of solicitude was general among them, which cannot reasonably be supposed to have affected one hundredth part of them. It is a very ingenious, and more than plausible, conjecture of Wet. that ἡλικια, or the ordinary term of life, is here considered under the figure of the *stadium*, or course gone over by the runners, of which, as it consisted of several hundred cubits, a single *cubit* was but as one step, and consequently a very small proportion of the whole, and what might not improperly be termed ελαχιστον. It adds to the credibility of this, that the life of man is once and again distinguished in Scripture by the appellation δρομος, the course or ground run over by the racers. This is the more remarkable, and shows how much their ears were accustomed to the trope; as it occurs sometimes in places where no formal comparison to the gymnastic exercises, is made, or even hinted. Thus, Acts xiii. 25. *As John fulfilled his course*, ὡς επληρου τον δρομον. xx. 24. *Neither count I my life dear unto myself*, says Paul, *so that I might finish my course with joy*, ὡς τελειωσαι τον δρομον μου. And 2 Tim. iv. 7. *I have finished my course*, το δρομον τετελεκα. The phrase ὁ τροχος της γενεσεως, James iii. 6. has nearly the same signification. The uncommon pains which Herod the great had taken to establish gymnastic exercises in the country, to the great scandal of many, had familiarised the people to

such idioms. Several critics of name favour this interpretation, amongst whom are Ham. Wet. and Pearce. The An. Hey. Wes. and Wa. adopt it. Some other interpreters give it as a probable version in their notes.

31. *Seek ye the kingdom of God, ζητειτε την βασιλειαν του Θεου.* Vul. *Quærite primum regnum, Dei et Justitiam ejus.* There is no countenance from either MSS. or versions worth mentioning in favour of *primum* or of *et justitiam ejus.*

32. *My little flock, το μικρον ποιμνιον.* E. T. *Little flock.* We have here the dimunitive *ποιμνιον* combined with the adjective *μικρον, little.* It is, therefore, an expression of tenderness, at the same time that it suggests the actual smallness of their number. It has also the article, which we never use in the vocative. In our language we cannot better supply the diminutive and the article, than by the possessive pronoun.

35. The Vul. after *ardentes* adds *in manibus vestris.* This variation is peculiar to that version. The Sax. follows the Gr.

46. *With the faithless, μετα των απιστων.* E. T. *With the unbelievers.* Those are called here *απιστοι* who, in Mt. are called *υποκριται.* Both words have great extent of signification. And for the reason given, in the note on that passage, against rendering *υποκριται hypocrites, απιστοι* ought not here to be rendered *unbelievers,* but according to the most common acceptation of the word, *the faithless,* that is, persons totally unworthy of trust.

49. *What would I, but that it were kindled? τι θελω, ει ηδη ανηφθη;* E. T. *What will I, if it be already kindled?* Vul. *Quid volo nisi ut accendatur?* Er. Zu. Be. *Quid volo, si jam accensus est?* Cas. *Qui, si jam incensus est, quid volo?* It is evident to me, that the sense is better expressed in the Vul. than by any of the modern La. interpreters. The objection which Be. and after him Palairet, make, that the *ει* is there translated as if it were *ει μη,* is of no moment, since the *ει* in this verse is, by the acknowledgment of the latter, not the hypothetical conjunction, but a particle expressive of a wish. What Gro. says of this rendering is entirely just, "in eo sensum recte expressit, verba non annumeravit." The very next verse would sufficiently evince the meaning, if there could be a reasonable doubt about it. *I have an immersion to undergo, and how am I pained till it be accomplished?* 'Since the advancement of true religion, which,

is the greatest blessing to mankind, must be attended with such unhappy divisions, I even long till they take place." L. Cl. renders it in the same way with the Vul. *Que souhaite-je, sinon qu'il fut deja enflammé ?* Here the meaning is expressed with simplicity and modesty, as in the original. But I cannot help disrelishing much the manner in which Dod. and after him Wy. have expressed it, though in the general import it does not differ from the last mentioned. *What do I wish ? Oh, that it were already kindled !* This form of venting a wish, is, in a case like the present, when he knew that the event would soon happen, strongly expressive of impatience. I know not any thing whereby interpreters have more injured the native beauty of the style of Scripture, than by the attempts they have sometimes made to express the sense very emphatically.

58. *To satisfy him,* απηλλαχθαι απ' αυτου. E. T. *That thou mayest be delivered from him.* But a man is delivered from another who makes his escape from him, either by artifice or by force, or who is reseued by another. Now the words *delivered from* suggest some such method of deliverance, rather than that which is here signified by the term απηλλαχθαι, a deliverance with consent. To this the parallel place, Mt. v. 25. also evidently points.

CHAPTER XIII.

9. *Perhaps it will bear fruit ; if not, thou mayest afterwards cut it down,* κ'αν μεν ποιηση καρτον· ει δε μηγε, εις το μελλον εκκοψεις αυτην. E. T. *And if it bear fruit, well ; and if not, then after that thou shalt cut it down.* It is plain, that there is an ellipsis in the Gr. ; some word is wanting after καρπον to complete the sense. In sentences of the like form, in Gr. writers, when the words wanting are easily supplied by the aid of the context, this figure is not unfrequent : nay, it has sometimes a peculiar energy. As the effect, however, is not the same in modern languages, it is generally thought better to complete the sentence, either by adding the word, or words, wanting, or by making a small alteration on the form of expression. I have preferred the latter of these methods, our translators have followed the former. The difference is not material.

15. *Hypocrites.* E. T. *Thou hypocrite.* In the common Gr. we read *ὑποκριτα*, in the singular number; but in many MSS. some of principal note, in the Com. and other early editions, in the Vul. Cop. Arm. Eth. Sax and Ara. versions we find the word in the plural. The very next words, *ἑκαστος ὑμων*, show that our Lord's answer was not addressed solely to *the director*, but was intended for all those present who espoused his side of the question. Mill, and several other critics have preferred this reading.

25. *If once the master of the house shall have arisen, αφ' ου αν εγερθη ὁ οικοδεσποτης.* Vul. *Cum autem intraverit paterfamilias.* In one or two copies we find *εισελθη* instead of *εγερθη*. But this reading of the Vul. though favoured by Cas. and the Sax. translation, has no support of either MSS. or versions to entitle it to regard.

31. *Herod intendeth to kill thee, Ἡρωδης θελει σε αποκτειναι.* E. T. *Herod will kill thee.* But if this last declaration in Eng. were to be turned into Gr. the proper version would be, not what is said by L. but *Ἡρωδης σε αποκτειει.* The term *will* in Eng. so situated, is a mere sign of the future, and declares no more than that the event will take place. This is not what is declared by the Evangelist. His expression denotes that, at that very time, it was Herod's purpose to kill him; for the *θδλει* here is the principal verb; the *will* in the translation is no more than an auxiliary. Nay, the two propositions (though, to a superficial view, they appear coincident) are in reality so different, that the one may be true and the other false. Suppose that, instead of Herod, Pilate had been the person spoken of. In that case, to have said in Gr. *Πιλατος θελει σε αποκτειναι*, would have been telling a falsehood; for the history shows how much his inclination drew the contrary way: whereas, to have said *Πιλατος σε αποκτενει* would have been affirming no more than the event verified, and might, therefore have been accounted prophetical. Mt. xvi. 24. N. J. vii. 17. N.

CHAPTER XIV.

1. *Of one of the rulers who was a Pharisee, τινος των αρχοντων των Φαρισαιων.* E. T. *Of one of the chief Pharisees.* I

agree with Gro. Ham. Wh. Pearce, and others, that *αρχοντες* properly denotes persons in authority, rulers, magistrates; and that any other kind of eminence or superiority would have been distinguished by the term *πρωτοι*, as in ch. xix. 47. Mr. vi. 21. Acts xiii. 50. xvii. 4. xxv. 2. xxviii. 17.

5. *If his ass or his ox*, *ονος η βους*. Both the Sy. interpreters have read here *υιος*, *son*, instead of *ονος*, *ass*, and so have some of the Fathers. The number and value of the MSS. which preserve this reading, are very considerable; and though it is not found in any ancient version except the Sy. yet if we were to be determined solely by the external evidence, I should not hesitate to declare that the balance is in its favour. There is, however, an internal improbability in some things, which very strong outward evidence cannot surmount. The present case is an example; and therefore, though this reading has been admitted by Wet. and some other critics, I cannot help rejecting it, as, upon the whole, exceedingly improbable. My reasons are these: First, Nothing is more common in Scripture style, wherever propriety admits it, than joining in this manner *the ox* and *the ass*, which were in Judea almost the only beasts in common use for work. In the O. T. it occurs very frequently. We find it in the tenth commandment, as recorded in Exod. xx. and both in the fourth and in the tenth, as repeated in Deut. v. When a case like the present is supposed, *of falling into a pit*, Exod. xxi. 33. both are, as usual, specified. *If a man shall dig a pit, and not cover it, and an ox or an ass fall therein*—. That this was also conformable to our Lord's manner, we may see from the preceding chapter, v. 15. *Who is there amongst you that doth not, on the Sabbath, loose his ox or his ass from the stall, and lead him away to watering?* Secondly, Such a combination, as that of *the ass* and *the ox*, is not more familiar and more natural, than the other, of a man's *son* and his *ox*, is unnatural and unprecedented. Things thus familiarly coupled in discourse, are commonly things homogeneal, or of natures, at least, not very dissimilar. Such are, *the son and the daughter, the man-servant and the maid-servant, the ox and the ass.* Thirdly, In those specimens which our Lord has given of confuting the Pharisees, by retorting on them their own practice, the argument is always of that kind which logicians call *à fortiori*. This cir-

cumstance is sometimes taken notice of in the application of the argument, and even when it is not expressly pointed out, it is plain enough from the sense. See ch. xiii. 15, 16. xv. 2, 3, 4. 8, 9. Mt. xii. 11, 12. But if the word here be *son*, this method is reversed, and the argument loses all its energy. A man, possessed of even the Pharisaical notions concerning the Sabbath, might think it, in the case supposed, excusable from natural affection, or even justifiable from paternal duty, to give the necessary aid to a child in danger of perishing, and, at the same time, think it inexcusable to transgress the commandment for one to whom he is under no such obligations. Fourthly, When the nature of the thing, and the scope of the place render it credible that a particular reading is erroneous, the facility of falling into such an error adds greatly to the credibility. Now *υιος* and *ονος*, in writing, have so much resemblance, that we cannot wonder that a hasty transcriber should have mistaken one for the other. If the mistake has been very early, the number of copies now affected by it would be the greater. It is too mechanical a mode of criticising, to be determined by outward circumstances alone, and to pay no regard to those internal probabilities, of which every one who reflects must feel the importance.

15. *Who shall feast*, *ὁς φαγεται αρτον*. E. T. *Who shall eat bread*. *To eat bread* is a well-known Heb. idiom for to share in a repast, whether it be at a common meal, or at a sumptuous feast. The word *bread* is not understood as suggesting either the scantiness or the meanness of the fare.

[a] *In the reign*, *εν τη βασιλεια*. E. T. *In the kingdom*. The E. T. makes, to appearance, the word *βασιλεια* here, refer solely to the future state of the saints in heaven. This version makes it relate to those who should be upon the earth in the reign of the Messiah. My reasons for preferring the latter are these: 1st, This way of speaking of the happiness of the Messiah's administration, suits entirely the hopes and wishes which seem to have been long entertained by the nation concerning it. (See ch. x. 23, 24. Mt. xiii.10, 11.) 2dly, The parable which, in answer to the remark, was spoken by our Lord, is, on all hands, understood to represent the Christian dispensation. 3dly, The obvious intention of that parable is to insinuate that, in consequence of the prejudices which, from notions of secular felicity and grandeur, the nation, in general, entertained, on

that subject; what, in prospect, they fancied so blessed a period, would, when present, be exceedingly neglected and despised; and, in this view, nothing could be more apposite; whereas, there appears no appositeness in the parable on the other interpretation.

23. *Compel people to come*, *αναγκασον ειδελθειν*. Ch. xxiv. 29. N.

26. *Hate not his father*, *ου μισει τον πατερα εαυτου*. It is very plain, that *hating*, used in this manner, was among the Hebrews an idiomatic expression for *loving less*. It is the same sentiment, which in Mt.'s Gospel, x. 37. is conveyed in these words, *He who loveth father or mother more than me*—. In the strict acceptation of the term, the doctrine of Christ does not permit us to hate any one, not even an enemy, much less a parent, to whom it exacts a more substantial honour than the traditional system of the scribes represented as necessary. The things here enumerated, particularly what finishes the list, of which I am to speak immediately, show evidently that the language is figurative.

[2] *Nay, and himself too*, *ετι δε και την εαυτου ψυχην*. E. T. *Yea, and his own life also*. Vul. *Adhuc etiam et animam suam*. Cas. *Atque adeo suam ipsius animam*, which he explains on the margin, *semetipsum*. Dio. renders it *anzi anchora se stesso*. The reasons for which I have preferred this last manner are the following: First, *ψυχη* is generally used in the Hellenistic idiom as corresponding to the Heb. נפשׁ *nephesh*, *soul* or *life*. Now it is well known, that this word, with the affix, is frequently used in Heb. for the reciprocal pronoun. Thus נפשׁי *naphshi*, commonly rendered in the Sep. *η ψυχη μου*, is *myself*, בפיך *naphshecha*, *η ψυχη σου*, *thyself*, and so of the rest. See Lev. xi. 43. Esth. iv. 13. Ps. cxxxi. 2. Now as there runs through the whole of this verse in L. an implicit comparison; to preserve an uniformity in the manner of naming the particulars, shows better the preference which our Lord claims in our hearts, not only to our nearest relatives, but also to ourselves. Secondly, I have avoided the phrase *hating his life*, as ambiguous, and often used, not improperly, of those who destroy themselves. Now the disposition which our Lord here requires of his disciples, is exceedingly different from that of those persons. For the like reason I have not said *hate his own soul*, though what many

would account the most literal version of them all. For this expression is also used sometimes (see Prov. xxix. 24.) in a sense quite different from the present. Thirdly, I prefer here this strong manner of exhibiting the sentiment, as, in such cases, whatever shows most clearly that the words cannot be literally understood, serves most effectually to suggest the figurative and true interpretation. Now as, in the common acceptation, to hate one's parents would be impious, the Apostle Paul tells us, Eph. v. 29. that to hate one's self is impossible. It is not in this acceptation then that we can look for the meaning.

CHAPTER XV.

1. The Vul. the Sy. and the Sax. have no word answering to *all* in this sentence.

16. *He was fain*, επεθυμει. Ch. xvi. 21. N.

[2] *With the husks*, απο των κερατιων. Vul. *De siliquis.* That κερατιον answers to *siliqua*, and signifies *a husk*, or pod, wherein the seeds of some plants, especially those of the leguminous tribe, are contained, is evident. But both the Gr. κερατιον and the La. *siliqua* signify also the fruit of the carob-tree, a tree very common in the Levant, and in the southern parts of Europe, as Spain and Italy. The Sy. and Ara. words are of the same import. This fruit still continues to be used for the same purpose, the feeding of swine. It is also called *St. John's bread*, from the opinion that the Baptist used it in the wilderness. It is the pod only that is eaten, which shows the propriety of the names κερατιον and *siliqua*, and of rendering it into Eng. *husk*. Miller says, it is mealy, and has a sweetish taste, and that it is eaten by the poorer sort, for it grows in the common hedges, and is of little account.

18. *Against heaven*, that is, *against God.* Diss. V. P. I. § 4.

22. *Bring hither the principal robe*, εξενεγκατε την στολην την πρωτην. Vul. *Cito proferte stolam primam.* Ταχεως is found in the Cam. and one other MS. of small note. The second Sy. Cop. Sax. and Arm. versions have also read so.

30. *Thy living*, σου τον βιον. Vul. *Substantiam suam.* The

reading of the Vul. has no support from ancient versions or Gr. MSS. unless we reckon the Cam. which reads *παντα* without any pronoun.

CHAPTER XVI.

8. *Commended the prudence of the unjust steward, επηνεϑε τον οικονομον της αδικιαμως, ότε φρονιμως εποιησεν.* E. T. *Commended the unjust steward, because he had done wisely.* When an active verb has for its subject a quality, disposition, or action, of a person, it is a common Heb. idiom to mention the person, as that which is directly affected by the verb, and to introduce the other (as we see done here) by a conjunction,—*commended the unjust steward, because he had acted prudently*, that is, *commended the prudence which he had shown in his action.* Properly his master commended neither the actor nor the action, but solely the provident care about his future interest, which the action displayed; *a care* worthy the imitation of those who have in view a nobler futurity, eternal life.

[2] *Τον οικονομον της αδικιας* for *τον αδικον*, in like manner as *ό κριτης της αδικιας*, ch. xviii. 6. for *ό αδικος*, *the unjust judge.*

[3] *In conducting their affairs, εις την γενεαν την εαυτων.* E. T. *In their generation.* *Γενεα* is the word by which the Seventy commonly render the Heb. דור *dor*, which signifies not only age, *seculum*, and generation, or the people of the age, but also a man's manner of life. Thus Noah is said, Gen. vi. 9. to be *τελειος εν τη γενεα αυτου.* Houbigant renders it *integer in viis suis.* It is true he conjectures very unnecessarily a different reading. Yet he himself, in another place, admits this as one meaning of the Heb. word דור *dor.* Thus Is. liii. 8. the words rendered in the Sep. *την γενεαν αυτου τις διηγησεται*, he translates *ejus omnem vitam quis secum reputabit?* and in the notes defends this translation of the Heb. דור *dor.* To the same purpose bishop Lowth, in his late version of that prophet, *His manner of life who would declare?*

9 *With the deceitful mammon, εκ του μαμωνα της αδικιας.* E. T. *Of the mammon of unrighteousness.* Here again the substantive is employed by the same Hebraism, as in the preceding verse, to supply the place of the adjective, *μαμωνα της αδικιας*, as *οικονο-*

μον της αδικιας. The epithet *unrighteous*, here applied to mammon or riches, does not imply acquired by injustice or any undue means ; but, in this application, it denotes *false* riches, that is, *deceitful*, not to be relied on. What puts this beyond a question is, that, in v. 11. τω αδικω μαμωνα is contrasted, not by το δικαιον, but by το αληθινον, the former relating to *earthly* treasure, the latter to *heavenly*. For the import of mammon, see Mt. vi. 24. N.

[2] *After your discharge*, ὁταν εκλιπητε. E. T. *When ye fail*. As this is spoken in the application of the parable, it is to be understood as referring to that circumstance which must sooner or later happen to all, and which bears some analogy to the steward's dismission from his office. This circumstance is *death*, by which we are totally discharged from our employment and probation here. The word *fail*, in the common version, is obscure and indefinite. I have preferred *discharge*, as both adapted to the expression of the Evangelist, and sufficiently explicit. It bears a manifest reference to the act whereby a trustee is divested of his trust, and is also strictly applicable to our removal out of this world. Cas. has happily preserved this double allusion in La. by saying, *Quum defuncti fueritis*. L. Cl. has not been so fortunate in Fr. ; he says, *Quand vous serez expirez*. The verb here shows clearly the future event pointed to, but detaches it altogether from the story ; for the word *expirez* cannot be applied to the discarding of a steward from office. Of so much use in interpreting do we sometimes find words which are, in a certain degree, equivocal.

[3] *Into the eternal mansions*, εις τας αιωνιους σκηνας. E. T. *Into everlasting habitations*. As σκηνη properly signifies *a tent* or *tabernacle*, which is a temporary and moveable habitation, some have thought it not so fitly joined with the epithet αιωνιος. It is true that in strictness, σκηνη means no more than *a tent ;* but it is also true, that sometimes it is used with greater latitude, for *a dwelling* of any kind, without regard either to its nature or its duration. The article has been very improperly, in this passage, overlooked by our translators. It adds to the precision, and consequently to the perspicuity, of the application. J. i. 14. [2] N.

16. *Every occupant entereth it by force*, πας εις αυτην βιαζεται. E. T. *Every man presseth into it*. Though this last interpretation may be accounted more literal than that here given, it is

farther from the import of the sentence. The intention is manifestly to inform us, not how great the number was of those who entered into the kingdom of God, but what the manner was in which all who entered obtained admission. The import, therefore, is only, *Every one who entereth it, entereth it by force.* We know, that during our Lord's ministry, which was, (as John's also was) among the Jews; both his success and that of the Baptist were comparatively small. Christ's flock was literally, even to the last, *ποιμνιον μικρον, a very little flock.* Of the backwardness of the people, we hear frequently in the Gospel. *He came to his own*, says the Apostle John, *but his own received him not.* And he himself complains, *Ye will not come unto me, that ye may have life.* It was not till after *he was lifted up* upon the cross, that, according to his own prediction, he *drew all men to him.*

20. *A poor man, πτωχος τις.* E. T. *A certain beggar.* Though either way of rendering is good, the first is more conformable to the extensive application of the Gr. word, than the second. *To beg* is always in the N. T. *απαιτειν* or *προσαιτειν.* The present participle *προσαιτων*, agreeably to a well known Heb. idiom, strictly denotes *a beggar.*

21. *Was fain to feed on the crumbs, επιθυμων χορτασθηναι απο των ψιχιων.* E. T. *Desiring to be fed with the crumbs.* I agree with those who do not think there is any foundation, in this expression, for saying that he was refused the crumbs. First, the word *επιθυμων* does not imply so much; secondly, the other circumstances of the story render this notion improbable. First, as to the scriptural sense of the word, the verb *επιθυμεω* is used by the Seventy, Is. i. 29. for rendering the Heb. בחר *bahar, elegit.* The clause is rendered, in the E. T. *For the gardens which ye have chosen.* In like manner, in Is. lviii. 2. the word occurs twice, answering to the Heb. חפץ *chaphats, to delight*, or *take pleasure in; γνωναι μου τας οδους επιθυμουσιν;* again, *εγγιζειν Θεω επιθυμουσιν.* E. T. *They delight to know my ways;* and, *They take delight in approaching to God.* It is not necessary to multiply examples. That the notion, that he did not obtain the crumbs, is not consistent with the other circumstances, is evident. When the historian says, that he was laid at the rich man's gate, he means not, surely, that he was once there, but that he was

usually so placed, which would not probably have happened, if he had got nothing at all. The other circumstances concur in heightening the probability. Such are, the rich man's immediately knowing him, his asking that he might be made the instrument of the relief wanted; and, let me add this, that though the Patriarch upbraids the rich man with the carelessness and luxury in which he had lived, he says not a word of inhumanity; yet, if we consider Lazarus as having experienced it so recently, it could hardly, on this occasion, have failed to be taken notice of. Can we suppose that Abraham, in the charge he brought against him, would have mentioned only the things of least moment, and omitted those of the greatest? For similar reasons, I have rendered *επεθυμει*, ch. xv. 16. in the same manner as here. In the E. T. the expression there suggests more strongly, that his desire was frustrated: *He would fain have filled his belly*, which, in the common idiom, always implies, *but could not*. It appears very absurd, that one should have the charge of keeping swine, who had it not in his power to partake with them. How could it be prevented? Would the master multiply his servants in time of famine, and send one to watch and keep this keeper? The clause, *for nobody gave him ought*, is to be interpreted not strictly, but agreeably to popular language; as though it had been said that in the general calamity he was much neglected, and if he had not had recourse to the food allotted for the swine, he would have been in imminent danger of starving.

[2] Much injury has been done to our Saviour's instructions, by the ill-judged endeavours of some expositors to improve and strengthen them. I know no better example for illustrating this remark, than the story of the rich man and Lazarus. Many, dissatisfied with its simplicity, as related by the Evangelist, and desirous, one would think, to vindicate the character of the Judge from the charge of excessive severity in the condemnation of the former, load that wretched man with all the crimes which blacken human nature, and for which they have no authority from the words of inspiration. They will have him to have been a glutton and a drunkard, rapacious and unjust, cruel and hard-hearted, one who spent in intemperance what he had acquired by extortion and fraud. Now, I must be allowed to remark that, by so doing, they totally pervert the de-

sign of this most instructive lesson, which is to admonish us, not that a monster of wickedness, who has, as it were, devoted his life to the service of Satan, shall be punished in the other world; but that the man who, though not chargeable with doing much ill, does little or no good, and lives, though not, perhaps, an intemperate, a sensual, life; who, careless about the situation of others, exists only for the gratification of himself, the indulgence of his own appetites, and his own vanity; shall not escape punishment. It is to show the danger of living in the neglect of duties, though not chargeable with the commission of crimes; and, particularly the danger of considering the gifts of Providence as our own property, and not as a trust from our Creator, to be employed in his service, and for which we are accountable to him. These appear to be the reasons for which our Lord has here shown the evil of a life which, so far from being universally detested, is, at this day, but too much admired, envied, and imitated.

[3] The Vul. adds, *Et nemo illi dabat;* but has no support, except that of one or two inconsiderable MSS. and the Sax. version. This reading has, doubtless, by the blunder of some copyist, been transcribed from the preceding chapter.

22. Vul. *Sepultus est in inferno.* This reading is equally unsupported with the former, and is a mere corruption of the text, arising from the omission of the conjunction in the beginning of verse 23. and the misplacing of the points.

For the illustration of several words in this and the following verses, such as *εν τω αδη—τον κολπον του Αβρααμ—απενεχθηναι—διαβηναι—διαπερωσιν*—see Prel. Diss. VI. P. II. § 19, 20.

25. A great many MSS. and some ancient versions, particularly the Sy. read *ωδε, here*, instead of *ὁδε, but he;* and this reading is adopted by Wet. The resemblance in sound, as well as in writing, may easily account for a much greater mistake in copying. But that the common reading is preferable, can hardly be questioned. In it *ὁ δε* is contrasted to *συ δε*, as *νυν* is, in like manner, to *εν ζωη σου;* but to *ωδε* nothing is opposed. Had *εχει* occurred in the other member of the comparison made by the Patriarch, I should have readily admitted that the probability was on the side of the Sy. version.

CHAPTER XVII.

1. *To his disciples, προς τους μαθητας.* Vul. *Ad discipulos suos.* This reading is favoured by the Al. Cam. and a considerable number of MSS. and by the 1st Sy. Cop. Arm. and Sax. versions. The 2d Sy. also has the pronoun, but it is marked as doubtful with an asterisk. The sense is nowise affected.

7. *Would any of you who hath a servant, &c. say to him, on his return from the field, Come immediately, τις δε εξ ὑμων δουλον εχων —εισελθοντι εκ του αγρου ερει ευθεως παρελθων.* E. T. *Which of of you having a servant—, will say unto him by and by, when he is come from the field, Go—* Vul. *Quis vestrum habens servum— Regresso de agro dicat illi, statim transi.* The only material difference between these two versions arises from the different manner of pointing. I have, with the Vul. joined *ευθεως* to *παρελθων.* Our translators have joined it to *ερει.* In this way of reading the sentence, the adverb is no better than an expletive; in the other, *ευθεως παρελθων* is well contrasted to *μετα ταυτα φαγεσαι* in the following verse.

10. *We have conferred no favour, δουλοι αχρειοι εσμεν.* Diss. XII. P. I. § 14.

11. *Through the confines of Samaria and Galilee, δια μεσον Σαμαρειας και Γαλιλαιας.* E. T. *Through the midst of Samaria and Galilee.* I agree with Gro. and others, that it was not through the heart of these countries, but on the contrary, through those parts in which they bordered with each other, that our Lord travelled at that time. I understand the words *δια μεσον*, as of the same import with *ανα μεσον*, as commonly understood. And in this manner we find it interpreted by the Sy. and Ara. translators. No doubt the nearest way, from where our Lord resided, was through the midst of Samaria. But had that been his route, the historian had no occasion to mention Galilee, the country whence he came; and if he had mentioned it, it would have been surely more proper, in speaking of a journey from a Galilean city to Jerusalem, to say, through Galilee and Samaria, than, reversing the natural order, to say, through Samaria and Galilee. But if, as I understand it, the confines only of the two countries were meant, it is a matter of no consequence which of them was first named. Besides, the incident recorded in

the following words, also renders it more probable that he was on the borders of Samaria, than in the midst of the country. It appears that there was but one Samaritan among the lepers that were cleansed, who is called an alien, the rest being Jews.

18. *This alien*, ὁ ἀλλογενὴς οὗτος. The Jews have, ever since the captivity, considered the Samaritans as aliens. They call them *Cuthites* to this day.

21. *The reign of God is within you*, ἡ Βασιλεια του Θεου εντος ὑμων εστιν. Vul. Er. Zu. *Regnum Dei intra vos est.* Cas. though not in the same words, to the same purpose. I should have added Be. too, who says, *Regnum Dei intus habetis ;* had he not shown, in his Commentary, that he meant differently, denoting no more, by *intus*, than *apud vos.* Most modern translators, and, among them, the authors of our common version, have rendered the words in the same way as the Vul. the Sy. and other ancient interpreters. L. Cl. and Beau. both, say, *Au milieu de vous*, and have been followed by some Eng. translators, particularly the An. and Dod. who say, *Among you.* This way of rendering has also been strenuously supported, of late, by some learned critics. I shall briefly state the evidence on both sides. That the preposition εντος, before a plural noun, signifies *among*, Raphelius has given one clear example from Xenophon's Expedition of Cyrus, the only one, it would appear, that has yet been discovered, for to it later critics, as Dod. and Pearce, have been obliged to recur. I have taken occasion, once and again, to declare my dissatisfaction with conclusions founded merely on classical authority, in cases where recourse could be had to the writings of the N. T. or the ancient Gr. translation of the Old. I acknowledge that εντος does not oft occur in either, but it does sometimes. Yet in none of the places does it admit the signification which those critics give it here. As I would avoid being tedious, I shall only point out the passages to the learned reader, leaving him to consult them at his leisure. The only other place in the N. T. is Mt. xxiii. 26. In the Sep. Ps. xxxviii. 4. cviii. 22. or, as numbered in the Eng. Bible, xxxix 3. cix. 22. and Cant. iii. 10. These are all the passages wherein εντος occurs as a preposition in that version. But it is sometimes used elliptically with the article τα, for the inside, or the things within, as Ps. cii. 1. in the Gr. but in the Eng. ciii. 1. Is. xvi. 11. Dan. x. 16. We have this

expression also twice in the Apocrypha, Ecclus. xix. 26. 1 Mac. iv. 48. Of all which I shall only remark, in general, that no advocate for the modern interpretation of *εντος ὑμων* in the Gospel, has produced any one of them as giving countenance to his opinion. Wh. (who, though a judicious critic, sometimes argues more like a party than a judge,) after explaining *εντος ὑμων ἐστιν* to mean, *is even now among you*, and, *is come unto you ;* adds, " so *εντος*, *ὑμων*, and *εν ὑμιν*, are frequently used in the O. T." Now, the truth is, that *εν ὑμιν*, does frequently occur in the O. T. in the acceptation mentioned, but *εντος ὑμων* never, either in that or in any other acceptation : nor does *εντος ἡμων* occur, nor *εντος αυτων*, nor any similar expression. The author proceeds to give examples : accordingly, his examples are all (as was unavoidable, for he had no other) of *εν ὑμιν*, and *εν ἡμιν*, not one of *εντος ὑμων*, or of any similar application of this preposition. Strange, indeed, if he did not perceive that a single example of this use of the preposition, *εντος* (which use he had affirmed to be frequent,) was more to his purpose than five hundred examples of the other. The instances of the other were, indeed, nothing to his purpose at all. The import of *εν*, in such cases, was never questioned ; and his proceeding on the supposition that those phrases were equivalent, was what logicians call a *petitio principii*, a taking for granted the whole matter in dispute. Nay, let me add, the frequency of the occurrence of *εν ὑμιν*, in Scripture, applied to a purpose to which *εντος ὑμων* is never applied, notwithstanding the numerous occasions, makes against his argument, instead of supporting it, as it renders it very improbable that the two phrases were understood as equivalent.—But to come from the external, to the internal, evidence ; it has been thought, that the interpretation, *amongst you*, suits better the circumstances of the times. The Messiah was already come. His doctrine was begun to be preached, and converts, though not very numerous, were made. This may be regarded as evidences that his reign was already commenced among them. But in what sense, it may be asked, could his reign or kingdom be said to be within them ? It is true, that the laws of this kingdom were intended for regulating the inward principles of the heart, as well as outward actions of the life ; but is it not rather too great a stretch in language, to talk of God's kingdom being within us ? So, I acknowledge, I thought

once ; but on considering the great latitude wherein the phrase, ἡ βασιλεια του Θεου, is used in the N. T. in relation sometimes to the epoch of the dispensation, sometimes to the place, sometimes for the divine administration itself, sometimes for the laws and maxims which would obtain ; I began to think differently of the use of the word in this passage. The Apostle Paul hath said, Rom. xiv. 17. *The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.* Now, these qualities, *righteousness, and peace, and spiritual joy*, if we have them at all, must be *within us*, that is, in the heart or soul. If so, the Apostle has, by implication, said no less than is reported here by the Evangelist, as having been said by our Lord, that the kingdom of God is *within us*. Is there any impropriety in saying that God reigns in the hearts of his people ? If not, to say, *the reign of God is in their hearts*, or *within them*, is the same thing, a little varied in the form of expression. Even the rendering of βασιλεια, *kingdom*, and not *reign*, heightens the apparent impropriety. But it is a more formidable objection against the common version, that our Lord's discourse was at that time addressed to the Pharisees : and how could it be said to men, whose hearts were so alienated from God, as theirs then were, that God reigned within them ? This difficulty seems to have determined the opinion of Dr. Dod. To this I answer, that in such declarations, conveying general truths, the personal pronoun is not to be strictly interpreted. It is not, in such cases *you* the individuals spoken to, but you of this nation, or you of the human species, men in general. In this way we understand the words of Moses, Deut. xxx. 11, 12, 13, 14. *This commandment which I command thee this day, it is not hidden from thee, neither is it far off. It is not in heaven, that thou shouldst say, Who shall go up for us to heaven, and bring it unto to us, that we may hear it, and do it ? Nor is it beyond the sea, that thou shouldst say, Who shall go over the sea for us, and bring it unto us, that we may hear it, and do it ? But the word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it.* This is not to be considered as characterising any individual (for let it be observed, that the pronoun is, throughout the whole, in the singular number,) nor even the whole people addressed. The people addressed had, by their conduct, shown too often, and too plainly, that the

commandments of God were neither in their heart, nor in their mouth. But it is to be considered as explaining the nature of the divine service; for it remains an unchangeable truth, that it is an essential character of the service which God requires from his people, that his word be habitually in their heart. The same sentiment is quoted by the Apostle, Rom. x. 6, &c. and adapted to the Gospel dispensation. I think further with Markland, that εντος ὑμων, as implying an inward and spiritual principle, is here opposed to παρατηρησις, outward show and parade, with which secular dominion is commonly introduced.

36. The whole of this verse is wanting in many MSS. some of them of great note. It is not found in some of the early editions, nor in the Cop. and Eth. versions. But both the Sy. versions, also the Ara. and the Vul. have it. In a number of La. MSS. it is wanting. Some critics suppose it to have been added from Mt. This is not improbable. However, as the evidence on both sides nearly balances each other, I have retained it in the text, distinguishing it as of doubtful authority.

CHAPTER XVIII.

1. *He also showed them by a parable that they ought to persist in prayer*, ελεγε δε και παραβολην, αυτοις προς το δειν παντοτε προσευχεσθαι. E. T. *And he spake a parable unto them, to to this end, that men ought always to pray.* The construction here plainly shows, that the word to be supplied before the infinitive is αυτους. Ελεγεν αυτοις—προς το δειν αυτους. The words are a continuation of the discourse related in the preceding chapter, which is here rather inopportunely interrupted by the division into chapters. There is, in these words, and in the following parable, a particular reference to the distress and trouble they were soon to meet with from their persecutors, which would render the duties of prayer, patience, and perseverance, peculiarly seasonable.

› *Without growing weary*, και μη εκκακειν. E. T. *and not to faint.* At the time when the common version was made, the Eng.

verb *to faint* was here of the same import with the expression I have used. But, as in that acceptation it is now become obsolete, perspicuity requires a change.

3. *Do me justice on my adversary*, εκδικησον με απο του αντιδικου μου. E. T. *Avenge me of mine adversary.* The Eng. verb *to avenge*, denotes either *to revenge* or *to punish;* the last especially, when God is spoken of as the avenger. The Gr. verb εκδικεω signifies also to *judge a cause*, and to defend the injured judicially from the injurious person. The word *avenge*, therefore, does not exactly hit the sense of the original in v. 3. although in the application of the parable, v. 7. it answers better than any other term. The literal sense is so manifest, and the connexion in the things spoken of is so close, that the change of the word in translating does not hurt perspicuity.

7. *Will he linger in their cause? και μακροθυμων επ' αυτοις.* E. T. *Though he bear long with them.* Vul. *Et patientiam habebit in illis?* Er. *Etiam cum patiens fuerit super illis.* Zu. *Etiamsi longa patientia utatur super illis.* Cas. *Et tam erit in eos difficilis?* Be. *Etiamsi iram differat super ipsis.* So various are the ways of interpreting this short clause. Let it be observed that both the Al. and the Cam. MSS. read μακροθυμει. The Vul. and even the Sy. appear to me to have read in the same manner; so also have some of the Fathers. But the version given here does not depend on that reading. The omission of the substantive verb, connected with the participle, is common in the Oriental idiom. I therefore understand μακροθυμων here as put for μακροθυμων εσται, and consequently equivalent to μακροθυμει. As μακροθυμειν commonly denotes to have patience, and as it sometimes happens that patient people appear slow in their proceedings, it comes, by an easy transition, to signify *to linger*, *to delay.* In this sense I understand it here with Gro. reading this member of the sentence, as well as the preceding, with an interrogation. The words quoted by him from the Son of Sirach, Ecclus. xxxii. 18. in the Gr. but in the E. T. which follows the Com. and the Vul. xxxv. 18. appear both perspicuous and decisive, Ὁ κυριος ου μη βραδυνη, ουδε μη μακροθυμησει επ' αυτοις. The first clause is justly interpreted in the E. T. *the Lord will not be slack;* but the second is rendered, both obscurely and in-

accurately, *neither will the mighty be patient towards them.* Properly thus, *neither will he linger in their cause.* The pronoun *their* refers to *the humble* mentioned in the preceding verse, whose prayer pierceth the clouds. To me it appears very probable, considering the affinity of the subject, that the Evangelist had, in the expression he employed, an allusion to the words of the Jewish sage.

9. *Will he find this belief in the land?* αρα ευρησει την πιστιν επι της γης ; E. T. *Shall he find faith on the earth?* There is a close connexion in all that our Lord says on any topic of conversation, which rarely escapes an attentive reader. If, in this, as is very probable, he refers to the destruction impending over the Jewish nation, as the judgment of heaven for their rebellion against God, in rejecting and murdering the Messiah, and in persecuting his adherents, την πιστιν must be understood to mean *this belief*, or the belief of the particular truth he had been inculcating, namely, that God will, in due time, avenge his elect, and signally punish their oppressors; and την γην must mean *the land*, to wit, Judea. The words may be translated either way; but the latter evidently gives them a more definite meaning, and unites them more closely with those which preceded.

9. *Example*, παραβολην. Mt. xiii. 3. N.

11. *The Pharisee, standing by himself, prayed thus,* ὁ Φαρισαιος σταθεις προς εαυτον ταυτα προσηυχετο. E. T. *The Pharisee stood and prayed thus with himself.* Our translators have considered the words προς εαυτον as connected with προσηυχετο, in which case they are a mere pleonasm. I have preferred the manner of Dod. and others, who join them to σταθεις; for in this way they are characteristical of the sect, who always affected to dread pollution from the touch of those whom they considered as their inferiors in piety.

13. *At a distance*, μακροθεν. Mt. viii. 30.

14. *Than the other*, η εκεινος. There is a considerable diversity of reading on this clause. A few copies have παρ' εκεινον, a great number η γαρ εκεινος, and others still differently. But the meaning is the same in all.

25. *Pass through, εισελθειν.* Vul. *Transire.* I have here, with the Eng. translators, preferred the reading of the Vul. to that of the common Gr. The MSS. however, are not unanimous. The Al. Cam. and a few others, read *διελθειν.* Agreeable to this is the version, not only of the Vul. but of the Go. Sax. second Sy. and Eth. Mt. xix. 24. N.

31. *All that the prophets have written shall be accomplished on the son of man. Τελεσθησεται παντα τα γεγραμμενα δια των προφητων, τω υιω του ανθρωπου.* E. T. *All things that are written by the prophets, concerning the son of man, shall be accomplished,* which is literally from the Vul. *Consummabuntur omnia quæ scripta sunt per prophetas de filio hominis.* This version must have arisen from a different reading. Accordingly the Cam. and two or three MSS. of no account, for *τω υιω* read *περι του υιου.* Agreeable to this also is the rendering of both the Sy. and the reading of some early editions. But this is not a sufficient reason for rejecting the common reading, especially when the sense conveyed by it, is equally good. Yet it has been deserted by most modern interpreters. Castalio has indeed adopted it. *Filio hominis accident planè omnia quæ sunt a vatibus scripta.* With this also agree the G. E. and Wes. Add to these Wa. in his New Translations lately published.

35. *When he came near Jericho, εν τω εγγιζειν αυτον εις Ιεριχω.* L. Cl. and Beau. *Comme il etoit prés de Jerico.* This manner is likewise adopted by most of the late Eng. translators. What recommends it is the consideration that thereby an apparent contradiction in the Evangelists is avoided; Mt. and Mr. having mentioned this miracle, as performed by our Lord, after he left Jericho. Gro. has remarked, that *ελγιζειν* means *to be near*, as well as *to come near*, which is true. But it is not less true, that in this acceptation, it is construed with the dative. When followed by the preposition *εις*, it always denotes, if I mistake not, to approach. A most extraordinary solution is given from Markland [Bowyer's conjectures,] who supposes an ellipsis, which he supplies thus, *εν τω εγγιζειν αυτον εις* [*supple Ιεροσολυμα εις*] *Ιεριχω.* If so, the translation here given is unexceptionable; for the ellipsis is just as easily supplied in Eng. as in Gr. *When they came near* [meaning *Jerusalem*, being at] *Jericho.* A liberty so unbounded is not more agreeable to the Gr. idiom than

to the Eng. It is alike repugnant to the idiom of every tongue, to authorise an interpreter to make a writer say what he pleases. Such licences are subversive of all grammar and syntax.

CHAPTER XIX.

2. *And chief of the publicans, και αυτος ην αρχιτελωνης.* E. T. *Which was the chief among the publicans.* This seems to imply, that he was the chief of the whole order in Palestine. Had this been the case, the name would have, most probably, been attended with the article. Thus it is always said *ὁ αρχιερευς* when *the high priest* is spoken of. In like manner, when there is in the nation but one of any particular office or dignity, as *ὁ βασιλευς, the king, ὁ ηγεμων, the procurator, ὁ ανθυπατος, the proconsul.* To have translated the word *a chief publican,* would have been, on the contrary, saying too little. This expression does not necessarily imply authority, or even that there were not, in the same place, some on a footing with him. Now, if the Evangelist had meant to say no more than this, I think his expression would have been *εις των αρχιτελωνων,* as we find, in the same way, *εις των αρχισυναγωγων* used, Mr. v. 22. Whereas, the manner in which L. mentions the circumstance of office here, *και αυτος ην αρχιτελωνης,* seems to show that, in the station he possessed, he was single in that place, and consequently that he was chief of the publicans of the city or district; for let it be observed that, though the Gr. article renders the noun to which it is prefixed perfectly definite, the want of it does not render a noun so decisively indefinite, as the indefinite article does in modern languages.

8. *If in aught I have wronged any man, ει τινος εσυκοφαντησα.* Diss. XII. P. I. § 16.

9. *Jesus said concerning him, ειπε προς αυτον ὁ Ιησους,* E. T. *Jesus said unto him.* The thing said shows clearly, that our Lord spoke, not to Zaccheus, but to the people concerning Zaccheus. He is mentioned in the third person, *καθοτι και αυτος, inasmuch as he also.* Of this mode of expression we have another example in the

very next chapter, v. 19. *εγνωσαν ὁτι προς αυτους την παραβολην ταυτην ειπε.* E. T. *They perceived that he had spoken this parable against them.* It is from the import of the parable itself that *προς αυτους* is rendered *against them;* for, had it been in their favour, there would have been no impropriety in saying *προς αυτους* to denote *concerning them*, or in relation to them. Another example we have, Heb. i. 7. *προς μεν τους αγγελους λεγει.* E. T. *Of the angels he saith.*

12. *To procure for himself the royalty*, *λαβειν ἑαυτω βασιλειαν.* E. T. *To receive for himself a kingdom.* To me it is manifest that *βασιλεια* here signifies *royalty*, that is, royal power and dignity. For that it was not a different kingdom from that wherein he lived, as the common version implies, is evident from v. 14. It is equally so, that there is in this circumstance an allusion to what was well known to his hearers, the way in which Archelaus, and even Herod himself, had obtained their rank and authority in Judea, by favour of the Romans. When this reference to the history of the times is kept in view, and *βασιλεια* understood to denote *royal power* and dignity, there is not the shadow of a difficulty in the story. In any other explanation, the expounder, in order to remove inconsistencies, is obliged to suppose so many circumstances not related, or even hinted, by the Evangelist, that the latter is, to say the least, made appear a very inaccurate narrator. The great latitude in which the word *βασιλεια* is used in the Gospel, will appear from several considerations, particularly from its being employed in ushering in a great number of our Lord's parables, wherein the subjects illustrated are very different from one another. Diss. V. P. I. § 7.

13. *Having called ten of his servants*, *καλεσας δε δεκα δουλους ἑαυτου.* E. T. *He called his ten servants.* This implies that he had neither more nor fewer than *ten servants*, who were all called. Had this been our Lord's meaning, the expression must have been *καλεσας δε τους δεκα δουλους ἑαυτου.* Thus Mt. x. 1. *προσκαλεσαμενος τους δωδεκα μαθητας αυτου. Having called to him his twelve disciples.* So also Mt. xi. 1. L. ix. 1. The article is never wanting while the number is complete.

[3] *Pounds.* Diss. VIII. P. I. § 7.

22. *Malignant*, *πονηρε.* Mt. xxv. 26.

26. *To every one who hath, more shall be given, Παντι τω εχοντι δοθησεται.* Vul. *Omni habenti dabitur, et abundabit.* For the two last words the La. has the sanction of five MSS. of no name, which read *και περισσευθησεται*, but of no version whatever.

32. *Found every thing as he had told them, ευρον καθως ειπεν αυτοις.* Vul. *Invenerunt, sicut dixit illis stantem pullum.* Agreeably to this a few MSS. but none of any note, read after *αυτοις*, *εστωτα τον πωλον.* The second Sy. the Sax. and the Arm. versions are also conformable to the Vul.

38. *In the highest heaven.* Ch. ii. 14. N.

42. *O that thou hadst considered, οτι ει εγνως και συ.* Ch. xii. 49. N.

43. *Will surround thee with a rampart, περιβαλουσι χαρακα σοι.* E. T. *Shall cast a trench about thee.* *Χαραξ* does not occur in any other place of the N. T.; but in some places wherein it occurs in the Sep. it has evidently the sense I have here given it. Indeed a *rampart*, or mound of earth, was always accompanied with a trench or ditch, out of which was dug the earth necessary for raising the rampart. Some expositors have clearly shown, that this is a common meaning of the word in Gr. authors. Its perfect conformity to the account of that transaction, given by the Jewish historian, is an additional argument in its favour.

CHAPTER XX.

1. *Teaching—and publishing the good tidings—διδασκοντος—και ευαγγελιζομενον—.* Diss. VI. P. V. § 14.

13. *Surely, ισως.* E. T. *It may be.* Though the latter may be thought the more common signification, the former suits better the genius of the parable, and the parallel passages. Besides, the word has often that signification in profane authors. It is found but once in the version of the Seventy, 1 Sam. xxv. 21. where it is evidently used in this sense, answering to the Heb. אך *ach*, *profecto*, and rendered in the E. T. *surely*. It occurs in no other place of the N. T.

35. *Who shall be honoured to share in the resurrection.* It may be remarked in passing, that our Lord, agreeably to the Jewish style

of that period, calls that only the *resurrection*, which is a resurrection to glory.

CHAPTER XXI.

8. *Saying, I am the person ; and the time approacheth*, λεγοντες, ὁτι εγω ειμι· και ὁ καιρος ηγγικε. The second clause, και ὁ καιρος ηγγικε, *and the time approacheth*, is capable of being understood as the words either of the false messiahs that would arise, or of our Lord himself. In the former case, the copulative και connects this clause with that immediately preceding, to wit, εγω ειμι ; in the latter, the connexion is made with the verb ελευσονται. Former expositors have, I think, in general, adopted the latter mode of interpreting, making these the words of our Lord. Of this number is Gro. who considers the second clause as equivalent to what is said, Mt. xxiv. 34. Mr. xiii. 30. *This generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled.* Most translators also have favoured this manner. Er. says, *Multi venient dicentes se esse Christum ; et tempus instat.* Had he understood both classes as the words of the impostors, he would have said *instare*. Cas. to the same purpose, *Qui se eum esse dicant* ; *et quidem tempus instat.* Such foreign translations as do not preserve the ambiguity of the original, seem all to approve the same explanation. Some late Eng. commentators have favoured the other, and have been followed by some interpreters, Dod. and Wes. in particular. Yet, in their translations themselves, this does not appear, unless from the pointing, or the notes. As very plausible things may be said on each side of the question, and as there does not appear any thing in the context, that can be accounted decisive, I consider this as one of those ambiguities which translators ought, if possible, to preserve. Most of them, indeed, have either accidentally or intentionally done so. Of this number is the Vul. *Dicentes quia ego sum, et tempus appropinquavit.* And the Zu. *Dicentes, Ego sum Christus, et tempus instat.* As also the E. T. *Saying, I am Christ, and the time draweth near.* Bishop Pearce seems to think that the words in the following verse, ουκ ευθεως το τελος, are said in direct contradiction to the clause, ὁ καιρος ηγγικε, and, consequently, show this to be the assertion of

the seducers. If our Lord had employed *ὁ καιρος* in this verse, instead of *το τελος*, I should have thought the argument very strong; but, as it stands, it has no weight at all. I know no interpreter who gives the same import to *καιρος*, in the eighth verse, and to *τελος*, in the ninth. And if they refer to different events, the one cannot be in opposition to the other.

15. *To refute, αντειπειν.* E. T. *To gainsay.* The import of the declaration is well expressed by Grotius, "Cui nihil contradici possit, quod veri habeat speciem." That their adversaries did actually *gainsay* or *contradict* them, we have from the same authority. Acts, xiii. 45. xxviii. 19. 22. It deserves, however, to be remarked, that the term in all these places is different from that used here. It is *αντιλεγειν* which, in the idiom of the sacred writers, is evidently not synonymous.

19. *Save yourselves by your perseverance, εν τη ὑπομονη ὑμων κτησασθε τας ψυχας ὑμων.* E. T. *In your patience possess ye your souls.* For the proper import of the word *ὑπομονη*, see ch. viii. 15. N. *Κταομαι* signifies not only *I possess*, but *I acquire*, and even *I preserve* what I have acquired; for it is only thus I continue to possess it. Such phrases as *αἱ ψυχαι ὑμων* were shown, ch. xiv. 26. N. to serve, in the Hellenistic idiom, for the reciprocal pronoun. The sentence is, therefore, but another manner of expressing the same sense, which Mt. has delivered (ch. x. 22.) in these words—*The man who persevereth to the end, shall be saved, ὁ ὑπομεινας εις τελος, ουτος σωθησεται.* That the words may have a relation to a temporal, as well as to eternal, salvation, is not to be doubted; but as the whole discourse is a prophecy, a translator ought not, from the lights afforded by the fulfilment, to attempt rendering it more explicit than it must have appeared to the hearers at the time. I shall only add, in passing, that there is a small deviation from the common, in the reading of the Vul. and the Sy. versions, where we find the future of the indicative instead of the imperative; in conformity to which, three or four MSS. have *κτησεσθε* instead of *κτησασθε*. But this makes no alteration in the sense. It may be even reasonably questioned, whether there has been any difference in the Gr. copies used by those translators. The future in Heb. is often no other than a more solemn expression of the imperative:

and, therefore, if I had not had occasion to make other remarks on the verse, I should have thought this too slight a difference to be taken notice of here.

21. *Let those in the city make their escape,* ὁι εν μεσῳ αυτης εκχωρειτωσαν. E. T. *Let them who are in the midst of it depart out.* Αυτης may here, very naturally, be thought at first to refer to Ιουδαια, mentioned in the former part of the verse. But the sense and connexion evidently show that it relates to Ἱερουσαλημ, mentioned in the foregoing verse. The next member of the sentence is a confirmation of this—και ὁι εν ταις χωραις, μη εισερχεσθωσαν εις αυτην. Here the fields could not be contrasted to Jerusalem, the metropolis; the contrast of *town* and *country* is familiar in every language. I do not urge that this suits better the events which soon followed: for if there were not ground for this interpretation from the context and the parallel passages in the other Gospels, it would be hazardous to determine what the inspired author has said, from what a translator may fancy he ought to have said, that the prediction might tally with the accomplishment. In this way of expounding, too much scope is given to imagination, perhaps to rooted prejudices and mere partiality.

23. *Woe unto the women with child.* Ch. vi. 24, 25, 26. N.

25. *Upon the earth,* επι της γης. Some late expositors think it ought to be rendered, *upon the land*, considering the prophecy as relating solely to Judea. The words, as they stand, may, no doubt, be translated either way. I have preferred that of the common version, for the following reasons: First, though what preceded seems peculiarly to concern the Jews, what follows appears to have a more extensive object, and to relate to the nations, and the habitable earth in general. There we hear of συνοχη εθνων, and of the things επερχομενων τη οικουμενη; not to mention what immediately follows, to wit, that the son of man shall be seen coming on a cloud, with great glory and power. Nor is it at all probable that, by the term εθνων, *nations*, used thrice in the preceding verse, manifestly for *Gentiles*, are meant in this verse only Jews and Samaritans. 2dly. The prediction which the verse under examination introduces, is accurately distinguished by the historian, as not commencing till after the completion of the former. It was not till after the calamities which were to befal the Jews, should be end

ed; after their capital and temple, their last resource, should be invested and taken, and the wretched inhabitants destroyed, or carried captive into all nations; after Jerusalem should be trodden by the Gentiles; nay, and after the triumph of the Gentiles should be brought to a period; that the prophecy contained in this and the two subsequent verses, should begin to take effect. The judicious reader, to be convinced of this, needs only give the passage an attentive perusal.

28. *Begin to be fulfilled,* Αρχομενων γινεσθαι. Mr. v. 17. N.

30. *When ye observe them shooting forth,* ὁταν προβαλωσιν ηδη, βλεποντες. Vul. *Cum producunt jam ex se fructum.* This addition of *fructum* is not favoured by any other version except the Sax. or even by any MS. except the Cam. which has τον καρπον αυτων.

CHAPTER XXII.

25. *They who oppress them are styled benefactors,* οι εξουσιαζοντες αυτων ενεργεται καλουνται. E. T. *They who exercise authority upon them are called benefactors.* The verb εξουσιαζειν, in its common acceptation, does not mean simply *to rule,* or govern, ποιμαινειν, αρχειν, ἡγεμονευειν, or κυβερναειν, but *to rule with rigour* and oppression, as a despot rules his slaves. It is, in this sense, used by the Apostle Paul, 1 Cor. vi. 12. ουκ εγω εξουσιασθησομαι ὑπο τινος. E.T. *I will not be brought under the power of any*; that is, 'How indifferent soever in themselves the particular gratifications may be;' for it is of this kind of spiritual subjection he is speaking, 'I will not allow myself to be enslaved by any appetite.' It seems to be our Lord's view, in these instructions, not only to check, in his Apostles, all ambition of power, every thing which savoured of a desire of superiority and dominion over their brethren, but also to restrain that species of vanity which is near a-kin to it, the affectation of distinction from titles of respect and dignity. Against this vice particularly, the clause under consideration seems to be levelled. The reflection naturally suggested by it is, How little are any the most pompous epithets which men can bestow, worthy the regard of a good man, who observes how vilely, through servility and flattery, they are sometimes prostituted to the most undeserving. That there is an

allusion to the titles much affected by monarchs and conquerors in those ages, amongst which, *benefactor*, EUERGETES, was one, there can be little doubt. To the same purpose, are those instructions wherein he prohibits their calling any man upon the earth their *father* or *teacher in things divine*, or assuming to themselves the title of *rabbi* or *leader*.

29, 30. *And I grant unto you to eat and drink at my table in my kingdom (forasmuch as my Father hath granted me a kingdom,) and to sit—κἀγω διατιθεμαι ὑμιν, καθως διεθετο μοι ὁ πατηρ μου, βασιλειαν· ινα εσθιητε και πινητε επι της τραπεξης μου, εν τη βασιλεια μου, και καθισησθε—.* E. T. *And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit—.* There is evidently an indistinctness in this version, which is not warranted by the original. At first, the grant to the disciples appears to be very different from what, by the explanation subjoined, it is afterwards found to be. The first is *a kingdom*, the second, *that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom.* See Mt. xxvi. 29. [2] N. *Βασιλειαν* is rendered as if it were governed by *διατιθεμαι*, and not as it is, both in reality, and to appearance, by *διεθετο*. Make but a small alteration in the pointing, remove the comma after *μου*, and place it after *βασιλειαν*, and nothing can be clearer or more explicit than the sentence. I have, for the sake of perspicuity, made an alteration on the arrangement of the words, but not greater than that made by our translators, which has the contrary effect, and involves the sentence in obscurity.

31. *Hath obtained permission. Εξητησατο.* Though with most interpreters, I said first *requested permission*, the word will bear, and the sense requires that it be rendered *obtained.*—Their danger arose chiefly, not from what Satan requested, but from what God permitted.

[2] *You* [*all*] *ὑμας.* The plural pronoun shows plainly that this was spoken of all the apostles, especially as we find it contrasted to the singular *περι σου*, directed to Peter in the same sentence. But this does not sufficiently appear in Eng. or any language wherein it is customary to address a single person in the plural. I have therefore to remove ambiguity, supplied the word [*all.*]

32. *When thou hast recovered thyself*, ὃν ἐπιστρεψας. E. T. *When thou art converted.* There is precisely the same reason against rendering ἐπιστρεψας, in this place, *converted*, which there is against rendering στραφητε, Mt. xviii. 3. in the same way. See the note on that verse.

36. *Let him who hath no sword, sell his mantle, and buy one*—ὁ μη εχων, πωλησατω το ἱματιον αυτου, και αγορασατω μαχαιραν. A great number of MSS. and some of note, have the two verbs in the future, πωλησει and αγορασει, instead of the imperative. In this way, it is also read in some of the oldest editions. I think, however, that there is no occasion here to desert the common reading. The sense in such prophetical speeches is the same, either way rendered. In the animated language of the Prophets, their predictions are often announced under the form of commands. The Prophet Isaiah, in the sublime prediction he has given us of the fate of the king of Babylon, thus foretells the destruction of his family (xiv. 21.): *Prepare slaughter for his children, for the iniquity of their fathers, that they do not rise, nor possess the land.* Yet the instruments by which Providence intended to effect the extirpation of the tyrant's family, were none of those to whom the prophecy was announced. The Prophet Jeremiah, in like manner, foretells the approaching destruction of the children of Zion, by exhibiting God as thus addressing the people (ix. 17, 18.): *Call for the mourning women, that they may come; and send for cunning women: and let them make haste, and take up a wailing for us, that our eyes may run down with tears, and our eye-lids gush out with waters.* There matter of sorrow is predicted, by commanding the common attendants on mourning and lamentation to be gotten in readiness; here warning is given of the most imminent dangers, by orders to make the customary preparation against violence, and to account a weapon more necessary than a garment. In the prophecy of Ezekiel (xxxix. 17, 18, 19.), and in the Apocalypse (xix. 17, 18.), so far is this allegoric spirit carried, that we find orders given to brute animals to do what the Prophet means only to foretell us they will do. Indeed, this is so much in the vivid manner of scriptural prophecy, that I am astonished that a man of Bishop Pearce's abilities should have been so puzzled to reconcile this clause to our Saviour's intention of yielding without resistance, that, rather than

admit it, he would recur to an expedient, whose tendency is but too evidently to render Scripture precarious and uncertain.

38. *Here are two swords—It is enough.* The remark here made by the disciples, and our Lord's answer, show manifestly two things; the first is, that his meaning was not perfectly comprehended by them; the second, that he did not think it necessary at that time, to open the matter further to them. Their remark evinces that they understood him literally; and it is, by consequence, a confirmation (if a confirmation were needed) of the common reading of verse 36. By his answer, Ἱκανον εστι, *It is enough;* though he declined attempting to undeceive them by entering further into the subject, he signified, with sufficient plainness, to those who should reflect on what he said, that arms were not the resource they ought to think of. For what were two swords against all the ruling powers of the nation? The import of the proverbial expression here used by our Lord, is, therefore, this, 'We need no more;' which does not imply that they really needed, or would use, those they had.

51. *Let this suffice,* εατε εως τουτου. E. T. *Suffer ye thus far.* This version is obscure, and susceptible of very different interpretations. All antiquity seems agreed in understanding our Lord's expression as a check to his disciples, by intimating that they were not to proceed further in the way of resistance; as it was not to such methods of defence that he chose to recur. What is recorded by the other Evangelists (Mt. xxvi. 52, 53. J. xviii. 11.), as likewise said on the occasion, strongly confirms this explanation. Another, indeed, has been suggested; namely, that the words were spoken to the soldiers, who are supposed, before now, to have seized his person; and that our Lord asked of them, that they would grant him liberty to go to the man whose ear had been cut off, that he might cure him; the only instance wherein Jesus needed the permission, or the aid, of any man, in working a miracle. An explanation this, every way exceptionable; but it is sufficient here to take notice, that it is totally destitute of evidence. Elsner, who favours this interpretation, after giving what he takes to be the sense, in a paraphrastical explanation, quotes, by way of evidence, two passages from the same author, in order to prove——what was never questioned by any body, that εως, followed by the genitive, some-

times answers to the La. *ad.* The only thing, in the present case, which requires proof, is, that such an ellipsis, made by the suppression of two principal words *με ελθειν*, is consistent with use in the language; and the only proof is precedents. Would *sinite ad istum*, in La. or, which is equivalent, *suffer to him*, in Eng. convey that sense? Yet nobody will deny, that *sinite me ire ad istum*, in the one language, and *suffer me to go to him*, in the other, clearly express it. Just so, it is admitted, that *εατε ελθειν εμε έως τουτου* would convey that sense, though *εατε έως τουτου* does not. The extent of use in Gr. is learnt only from examples, as well as in La. in Eng. Now, in the quotations brought by Elsner, there is no ellipsis at all; consequently they are not to the purpose. On the other hand, every body knows that *έως*, which is an adverb of time, when joined to *τουτου*, means commonly *hucusque*, *hitherto*; and that adverbs of time are occasionally used as nouns, may be easily exemplified in most languages. *Behold now*, says Paul, 2 Cor. vi. 2. *is the accepted time—Ιδου νυν καιρος ευπροσδεκτος.* The words of our Lord, then, in the most simple and natural interpretation, denote *Let pass what is done—Enough of this—No more of this.*

52. *Officers of the temple-guard, στρατηγους του ιερου.* E. T. *Captains of the temple.* The temple had always a guard of Levites, who kept watch in it, by turns, day and night. There are references to this practice in the O. T. both in the Prophets and in the Psalms. Over this guard, one of the priests was appointed captain; and this office, according to Josephus, was next in dignity to that of high priest. It appears from Acts iv. 1. v. 24. 26. as well as from the Jewish historian, that there was only one who had the chief command. The plural number is here used for comprehending those who were assigned to the captain as counsellors and assistants. The addition of the word *guard*, seemed to be necessary in Eng. for the sake of perspicuity.

[2] *Clubs, Ξυλων.* E. T. *Staves.* *A staff* is intended principally for assisting us in walking; *a club* is a weapon both offensive and defensive. The former is, in Gr. *ραβδος*; the latter, *ξυλον.* To show that these words are, in the Gospels, never used promiscuously, let it be observed, that, in our Lord's commands to his Apostles, in relation to the discharge of their office, when what concerned their own accommodation in travelling is spoken of, the word *ραβδος* is

used by all the three Evangelists, Mt. Mr. and L. who take particular notice of that transaction. But, in the account given by the same Evangelists of the armed multitude, sent by the high priests and elders to apprehend our Lord, they never employ the term ραβδος, but always ξυλον.

54. *Then they seized him, and led him away to the high priest's house,* συλλαβοντες δε αυτον ηγαγον, και εισηγαγον αυτον εις τον οικον του αρχιερεως. E. T. *Then took they him and led him, and brought him into the high priest's house.* Vul. *Comprehendentes autem eum, duxerunt ad domum principis sacerdotum.* The words και εισηγαγον αυτον, are not in the Cam. and two other MSS. and some Evangelistaries. The Sy. and Sax. interpreters, and therefore, probably the author of the old Itc. version, have not read them. It is plain they add nothing to the sense. Ηγαγον εις τον οικον, and εισηγαγον εις τον οικον, are the same thing. One of these, superadded to the other, is a mere tautology. Besides, there appears something of quaintness in the expression, αυτον ηγαγον και εισηγαγον αυτον, which is very unlike this writer's style. I have, therefore, preferred here the more simple manner of the Vul. and the Sy.

55. *When they had kindled a fire in the middle of the court,* ἁψαντων δε πυρ εν μεσω της αυλης. E. T. *When they had kindled a fire in the midst of the hall.* The expression εν μεσω, is an evidence that this αυλη was an open court. Besides, αυλη here appears contradistinguished to οικος, in the preceding verse. Mt. xxvi. 58. N.

66. *The national senate,* το πρεσβυτεριον του λαου. E. T. *The elders of the people.* I do not introduce this title here, as though there were any difficulty in explaining it, or any difference, in respect of sense, in the different translations given of it; but solely to remark, that this Evangelist is the only sacred writer who gives this denomination to the *sanhedrim;* for there can be no doubt that it is of it he is speaking. This is the only passage in the Gospel where it occurs. The same writer (Acts xxii. 5.) also applies the title πρεσβυτεριον, without the addition του λαου, to this court, or at least to the members whereof it was composed, considered as a body. I thought it allowable, where it can be done with

propriety (for it cannot in every case,) to imitate even these little differences in the style of the inspired penmen. Diss. XII. P. I. § 9, 10.

CHAPTER XXIII.

11. *A shining robe, εσθητα λαμπραν.* E. T. *A gorgeous robe.* Vul. *Veste alba.* Er. Zu. Cas. Be. *Veste splendida.* Though the Gr. word may be rendered either way, I prefer the latter, as denoting that quality of the garment which was the most remarkable; for this epithet was most properly given to those vestments wherein both qualities, white and shining, were united. That the word λαμπρος was used for *white*, the application of it by Polybius to the *toga* worn by the candidates for offices at Rome, if there were no other evidence, would be sufficient. But when nothing beside the colour was intended, the word λευκος was used, corresponding to the La. *albus*, as λαμπρος did to *candidus*. Such white and splendid robes were worn in the East by sovereigns. Herod caused our Lord to be dressed in such a garment, not, as I imagine, to signify the opinion he had of his innocence, but in derision of his pretensions to royalty. Perhaps it was intended to insinuate, that those pretensions were so absurd as to merit no other punishment than contempt and ridicule.

15. *He hath done nothing to deserve death, ουδεν αξιον θανατου εστι πεπραγμενον αυτω.* E. T. *Nothing worthy of death is done unto him.* This, though unintelligible, is a literal version from the Vul. Er. and Zu. *Nihil dignum morte actum est ei:* the meaning of which, as it is here connected, if it have a meaning, is, 'Herod hath not deserved to die for any thing he hath done to Jesus.' Now, as it is certain that this cannot be Pilate's meaning, being quite foreign from his purpose, I see no other resource but in supposing, that πεπραγμενον αυτω is equivalent to πεπραγμενον υπ' αυτου. I am not fond of recurring to unusual constructions: but here, I think, there is a necessity; inasmuch as this sentence of Pilate, interpreted by the ordinary rules, and considered in reference to his subject, is downright nonsense. As to other versions, the Sy. has rendered the words not more

intelligibly than the Vul. Cas. adopting the construction here defended, says, *nihil morte dignum ab hoc factum esse.* Be. to the same purpose, *nihil dignum morte factum est ab eo.* Lu. keeps close to the Vul. The G. F. has followed the Vul. in what regards the construction, but has introduced a supply, from conjecture, to make out a meaning,—*rien ne lui a eté fait, [qui importe qu'il soit] digne de mort.* Dio. has taken the same method,—*niente gli e stato fatto [di cio che si farebbe a uno] che havesse meritata la morte.* It is strange that Be. has not here been followed by any of those Protestant translators, who have sometimes, without necessity (where there was no difficulty in the words,) followed him in the liberties he had taken, much more exceptionable, in respect of the sense, than the present, and less defensible, in respect of the expression. Some more recent translators, both Fr. and Eng. L. Cl. Dodd. and others admit the manner of construing the sentence adopted here. I shall subjoin a few things, which had influence with me in forming a judgment of this matter. A similar example is not, I believe, to be found in the N.T. nor in the Sep.; but so many examples of πεπραγμενον τινι, for πεπραγμενον ὑπο τινος, have been produced from classical authors, by Raphelius and Wet. as show it to have been no uncommon idiom. Now, though L. abounds in Hebraisms, as much as any sacred writer, yet he has, oftener than the rest, recourse to words and idioms which he could acquire only from conversing with the Gentiles, or reading their authors; and has, upon the whole, as was observed before (Preface, § 11.), greater variety in his style than any other of the Evangelists. Further, it strengthens the argument, that πραῶσσειν ἀξιον θανατου, is a phrase not unfrequent with L. (see Acts xxv. 11. 25. xxvi. 31.) for expressing to do what deserved death; and, as the only inquiry on this occasion was, what Jesus had done, and what he deserved to suffer, there is the strongest internal probability, from the scope of the place, that it must mean what had been done by him, and not to him. Lastly, no other version that is both intelligible and suited to the context, can be given, without a much greater departure from the ordinary rules of interpretation and of syntax than that here made. To be convinced of this, one needs only consider a little the Itn. and G. F. translations of this passage above recited.

23. *Their clamours, and those of the chief priests, prevailed*—*κατισχυον αι φωναι αυτων και των αρχιερεων.* Vul. *Invalescebant voces eorum.* With this, agree one MS. which omits *και των αρχιερεων*, and the Sax. and Cop. versions.

35. *The elect of God, ὁ του Θεου εκλεκτος.* This title is adopted from Isaiah, xlii. 1. and appears to be one of those by which the Messiah was at that time distinguished. Diss. V. P. IV. § 14.

43. *Paradise.* Diss. VI. P. II. § 19, 20, 21.

50. *A senator named Joseph. Ανηρ ονοματι Ιωσηφ βουλευτης ὑπαρχων.* E. T. *A man named Joseph, a counsellor.* The word *βουλευτης* occurs nowhere in the N. T. but here and in the parallel passage in Mr. Some think that it denotes a member of the *sanhedrim*, the national senate, and supreme judicatory. Father Simon says that all the Jewish doctors thus applied the term *βουλευται*. See his Note on Mr. xv. 43. Gro. though doubtful, inclines rather to make Joseph a city magistrate ; and Lightfoot, founding also on conjecture, is positive that he was one of the council chamber of the temple. To me, the first appears far the most probable opinion. What the Evangelist advances, v. 51. is a strong presumption of this, and more than a counterbalance to all that has been urged by Gro. and Lightfoot, in support of their respective hypotheses. *He had not concurred,* says the historian, *in their resolutions and proceedings.* To the pronoun *αυτων their*, the antecedent, though not expressed, is clearly indicated by the construction to be *ὁι βουλευται, the senators.* And of these the crucifixion of Jesus is here represented as the resolution and the deed. With what propriety could it be called the deed of the city magistrates of Jerusalem, or (if possible, still worse) of a council which was no judicatory, being intended solely for regulating the sacred service, and inspecting the affairs of the temple ? The title *ευσχημων* given him by Mr. shows him to have been of the highest dignity. But, admit that this does not amount to a proof that Joseph was a memberof the *sanhedrim ;* there is no impropriety in rendering *βουλευτης senator.* The Eng. word admits the same latitude of application with the Gr. The La. *senator* is commonly rendered into Gr. *βουλευτης*, and this Gr. word, though rendered by the Vul. *decurio*, is translated by Er. Zu. Cas. and Be. *senator.* This rendering is, therefore, not improper, whatever was the case. But to say *one of the council*

chamber of the temple, if that was not the fact, is a mistranslation of the word. In all dubious cases, the choice of a general term is the only safe mode of translating: but the tendency of most interpreters is, at any risk, to be particular.

54. *The sabbath approached*, σαββατον επεφωσκε. Vul. *Sabbatum illucescebat.* The Jews, in their way of reckoning the days, counted from sun-set to sun-set, thus beginning the natural day, το νυχθημερον, with the night. This had been the manner from the earliest ages. Moses, in his history of the creation, concludes the account of the several days in this manner—*And the evening and the morning were the first day;*—and so of all the six, always making mention of the evening first. There is some reason to think that the same method of counting had, in very ancient times, prevailed in other nations. It was not, however, the way that obtained in the neighbouring countries in the time of the Apostles. Most others seem, at that time, to have reckoned as we do, from midnight to midnight; and, in distinguishing the two constituent parts of the natural day, named the morning first. Had the Jewish practice been universal, it is hardly possible that such a phrase as σαββατον επεφωσκε, *sabbatum illucescebat*, to signify that the sabbath was drawing on, had ever arisen. The expressions, then, might have been such as Lightfoot supposes, εις σαββατον εσκοτισθη, and *obtenebrescebat in sabbatum;* the sabbath being, as every other day, ushered in with darkness, which advances with it for several hours. The conjecture of Grotius, that L. in this expression, refers to the light of the stars, which do not appear till after sun-set, and to the moon, which gives at least no sensible light till then, is quite unsatisfactory. That the coming of night should, on this account, be signified by an expression which denotes the increase of light, is not more natural than it would be to express the progress of the morning at sun-rise, by a phrase which implies the increase of darkness, and which we might equally well account for by saying that, in consequence of the sun's rising, the stars disappear, and we no longer enjoy moon-shine. I am no better pleased with the supposition, to which Wet. seems to point, that there is an allusion here to a Jewish custom, of ushering in the sabbath by lighting lamps in their houses. The transactions spoken of in this chapter, were all without doors, where those lights could have no effect; besides, they were too in-

considerable to occasion so flagrant a deviation from truth, as to distinguish the advance of the evening by an expression which denotes the increase of the light. Lightfoot's hypothesis is, as usual, ingenious, but formed entirely on the language and usages of modern rabbies. He observes that, with them, the Hebrew אור, answering to the Greek φως, is used for night ; and, taking it for granted that this use is as ancient as our Saviour's time, the approach of night would naturally, he thinks, be expressed by επιφωσκω, *illucesco*. But, let it be observed that, as the rabbinical works quoted are comparatively recent, and as their language is much corrupted with modernisms from European and other tongues, it is not safe to infer, merely from their use, what obtained in the times of the Apostles. As to the word in question, certain it is, that we have no vestige of such a use in the O. T. There are not many words which occur oftener than אור ; but it never means night, or has been so rendered by any translator whatever. The authors of the Sep. have never used φως in rendering לילה, the Heb. word for *night*, nor νυξ in rendering אור. The word φως never signifies *night* in the Jewish Apocryphal writings, nor in the N. T. I even suspect that, in the modern rabbinical dialect, it does not mean *night* exclusively, but the natural day, νυχθημερον, including both ; in which case it is a mere Latinism, *lux* for *dies*. Nay, some of his own quotations give ground for this suspicion. What he has rendered *luce diei decimæ quartæ*, is literally from the original quoted *luce decima quarta*. Nor does it invalidate this opinion, that the thing mentioned, clearing the house of leaven before the passover, is, according to their present customs, dispatched in the night-time, and with candle-light. The expression may, notwithstanding, be used as generally as those employed in the law, which does not, in the discharge of this duty, confine them to the night ; nor does their use of candles or lamps, in this service, show that they confined themselves to the night. Even in the day-time, these are necessary for a search, wherein not a press or corner, hole or cranny, in the house, is to be left unexplored. But admitting that the rabbies have sometimes preposterously used the word אור, for the *night*, of which the learned author has produced the testimony of one of their glossaries, its admission into a work whose use is to interpret into proper Heb. the barbarisms and improprieties which

have, in latter ages, been foisted into their tongue, is itself sufficient evidence that it is a mere corruption. How, indeed, can it be otherwise? Moses tells us (Gen. i. 5.), that at the creation, *God called the light day, and the darkness he called night.* But this right use of words these preposterous teachers have thought proper to reverse being literally of the number of those stigmatized by the Prophet (Isaiah v. 20.) as putting *darkness for light, and light for darkness.* The way, therefore, wherein I would account for this expression of the Evangelist (a way which has been hinted by some former interpreters) is very simple. In all the nations round (the Jews, perhaps, alone excepted) it was customary to reckon the morning the first part of the day, the evening the second. Those who reckoned in this manner, would naturally apply the verb επιφωσκω to the ushering in of the day. L. who was, according to Eusebius, from Antioch of Syria, by living much among Gentiles, and those who used this style, or even by frequent occasions of conversing with such, would insensibly acquire a habit of using it. A habit of thus expressing the commencement of a new day, contracted where the expression was not improper, will account for one's falling into it occasionally, when, in consequence of a difference in a single circumstance, the term is not strictly proper. And this, by the way, is at least a presumption of the truth of a remark I lately made, that this Evangelist has, oftener than the rest, recourse to words and idioms which he must have acquired from the conversation of the heathen, or from reading their books. This is an expression of that kind which, though it might readily be imported, could not originate among the Jews. I shall only add, that the use which Mt. makes of the same verb (xxviii. 1.) is totally different. He is there speaking of the morning, when the women came to our Lord's sepulchre, which was about sun-rise. Here, on the contrary, the time spoken of is the approach of sun-set; for the setting of the sun made the beginning of the sabbath.

CHAPTER XXIV.

1. *With some others,* και τινες συν αυταις. These words are wanting in two or three MSS. They are also omitted in the Vul. Cop. Sax. and Eth. versions; but are in the Sy. and the Ara. The

external evidence against their admission, compared with the evidence in their favour, is as nothing. But a sort of internal evidence has been pleaded against them. As no women are named, either here, or in the conclusion of the preceding chapter, what addition does it makes to the sense to say, *with some others?* Or what is the meaning of it, where none are specified? I answer, the women spoken of here, though not named, are mentioned in the last verse but one of the foregoing chapter, under this description—*the women who had accompanied Jesus from Galilee.* Now, where is the absurdity of supposing that those pious women from Galilee were accompanied by some of our Lord's female disciples from Jerusalem and its neighbourhood? As it is certain that our Lord had there many disciples also, I see no reason why we should not here be determined solely by the weight and number of authorities.

12. *He went away musing with astonishment, on what had happened,* απηλθε, προς εαυτον θαυμαζων το γεγονος. Some point the words differently, removing the comma after απηλθε, and placing it after εαυτον; and, in consequence of this alteration, render the clause, *he went home wondering at what had happened.* Thus, J. xx. 10. Απηλθον ουν παλιν προς εαυτους οι μαθηται, is rendered in the E. T. *Then the disciples went away again unto their own home.* That the words of L. admit of such an adjustment and translation, cannot be denied. The common punctuation, however, appears to me preferable, for these reasons: 1st, It is that which has been adopted by all the ancient translations, the Cop. alone excepted. 2dly, It has a particular suitableness to the style of this Evangelist. Thus, ch. xviii. 11. προς εαυτον ταυτα προσηυχετο, is, in the E. T. rendered, *prayed thus with himself;* though, I confess, it admits another version; and, xx. 14. διελογιζοντο προς εαυτους, *they reasoned among themselves.* 3dly, It appears more probable from what we are told, verse 24th of this chapter, and from the account given by J. ch. xx. that Peter did not go directly home, but returned to the place where the Apostles, and some other disciples, were assembled. And this appears to be the import of απηλθον προς εαυτους, J. xx. 10. which see.

18. *Art thou alone such a stranger in Jerusalem as to be unacquainted?* Συ μονος παροικεις εν Ιερουσαλημ, και μη εγνως;

E. T. *Art thou only a stranger in Jurusalem, and hast not known?* There are two ways wherein the words of Cleopas may be understood by the reader: one is as a method of accounting for the apparent ignorance of this traveller; the other as an expression of surprise, that any one who had been at Jerusalem at the time, though but a stranger, should not know what had made so much noise amongst all ranks, and had so much occupied, for some days, all the leading men in the nation, the chief priests, the scribes, the rulers, and the whole sanhedrim, as well as the Roman procurator and the soldiery. The common version favours the first interpretation; I prefer the second, in concurrence, as I imagine, with the majority of interpreters, ancient and modern. I cannot discover with Be. any thing in it remote from common speech. On the contrary, I think it, in such a case as the present, so natural an expression of surprise that examples, remarkably similar, may be produced from most languages. Dio. O. *Συ αρα, ειπε, μονος ανηκοος ει τουτων ἃ παντες ιδασιν; Are you the only person who have never heard what all the world knows?* Cicero, *pro Milone:* "An vos, judices, vero soli ignoratis, vos hospites in hac urbe versamini; vestræ peregrinantur aures, neque in hoc pervagato civitatis sermone versantur?"

19. *Powerful in word and deed, δυνατος εν εργω και λογω.* I have here altered the order a little, for the sake of avoiding a small ambiguity; *in deed* might be mistaken for the adverb. The first of these phrases, *powerful in word*, relates to the wisdom and eloquence which our Lord displayed in his teaching; the other relates to the miracles which he performed.

25. *O thoughtless men! Ω ανοητοι.* E. T. *O fools.* The word is not *Ω μωροι.* The two words are not synonymous. The term last mentioned, is a term of great indignation, and sometimes of contempt; that employed here is a term of expostulation and reproof.

29. *They constrained him, παρεβιασαντο αυτον.* How did they constrain him? Did they lay violent hands on him, and carry him in, whether he would or not? The sequel shows—*saying, abide with us; for it groweth late, and the day is far spent.* The expression, in such cases, must always be interpreted according to popular usage. Usages, such as this, of expressing great urgency of solicitation by terms which, in strictness, imply force and compulsion,

are common in every tongue. How little, then, is there of candour, or at least of common sense, in the exposition which has been given by some, of a like phrase of the same writer, ch. civ. 23. *Compel them to come in, αναγκασον εισελθειν ?*

34. *Who said, The master is actually risen, and hath appeared unto Simon, Λεγοντας· Ὁτι ἠγερθη ὁ Κυριος οντως, και ωφθη Σιμωνι.* Mr. Markland (Bowyer's Conjectures) thinks that the words ought to be read interrogatively. "*Is the Lord risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon?* with a sneer on the credulity or veracity of the informers, Peter and Cleopas :" for these, he thinks, were the two to whom Jesus appeared on the road to Emmaus. Lightfoot's explanation is much to the same purpose. To me the words do not appear susceptible of this version. *Ἑυρον λεγοντας ὁτι* can never be made to introduce a question. There is no different reading, except that the Cam. reads *λεγοντες* for *λεγοντας*, in which it is singular. That Peter was one of the two, is improbable. He is not named by either Mr. or L. though Cleopas is by the latter, and though Peter never fails to be mentioned by name, by the sacred historians, when they record any transaction wherein he had a part. The opinion that he was one of the two seems to have arisen from a hasty assertion of Origen. It has not the support of tradition, which has from the beginning, been divided on this point; some thinking L. himself the unnamed disciple, some, Nathanael, others one of the Seventy sent by our Lord, in his lifetime. The great object of this attempt of Markland's, is to avoid an apparent contradiction to the words of Mr. who says (xvi. 13.) that when the two disciples, at their return, acquainted the rest, "they did not believe them." This, which is, in fact, the only difficulty, does not imply that none of them believed, but that several, perhaps the greater part, did not believe. On the other hand, when L. tells us, that the eleven and those with them said, "The Master is actually risen, and hath appeared unto Simon," we are not to conclude that every one said this, or even believed it ; but only that some believed, one of whom expressly affirmed it. Such latitude in using the pronouns is common in every language. Mt. and Mr. say that the malefactors who suffered with Jesus reproached him on the cross. From L. we learn that it was only one of them who acted thus.

36. *Peace be unto you*, *ειρηνη υμιν*. Vul. *Pax vobis : ego sum, nolite timere.* Two Gr. MSS. agreeably to this translation, add *εγω ειμι μη φοβεισθε.* Both the Sy. also the Cop. the Sax. and the Arm. versions, are conformable to this reading.

43. *Which he took and ate in their presence*, *και λαβων ενωπιον αυτων εφαγεν.* Vul. *Et cum manducasset coram eis, sumens reliquias dedit eis.* With this agree the Cop. and the Sax. versions, and the three Gr. MSS. which add *και τα επιλοιπα εδωκεν αυτοις.* There are some other variations on this verse, which it is not necessary here to specify.

44. *In the law of Moses, and the Prophets, and the Psalms*, *εν τω νομω Μωσεως και Προφηταις και Ψαλμοις.* Under these three, the Jews were wont to comprehend all the books of the O. T. Under the name *law*, the five books called the Pentateuch were included ; the chief historical books were joined with *the Prophets ;* and all the rest with *the Psalms.*

49. *I send you that which my Father hath promised.* Diss. XII. P. I. § 14.

[2] The name of Jerusalem is omitted in the Vul. and Sax. versions. It is wanted also in three noted MSS.

52. *Having worshipped him*, *προσκυνησαντες αυτον :* that is, *having thrown themselves prostrate before him*, as the words strictly interpreted, imply. Mt. ii. 2. [3] N.

NOTES

CRITICAL AND EXPLANATORY.

THE GOSPEL BY JOHN.

CHAPTER I.

1. *In the beginning was the word*, εν αρχη ην ὁ λογος. I have here followed the E. T. and the majority of modern versions. Vul. and Zu. *In principio erat verbum.* Er. Be. and Cas. have, instead of *verbum*, used the word *sermo.* The Gr. word λογος is susceptible of several interpretations, the chief of which are these two, *reason* and *speech*—*ratio* and *oratio.* The former is properly ὁ λογος ὁ ενδιαθετος, *ratio mente concepta;* the latter ὁ λογος ὁ προφορικος, *ratio enunciativa.* The latter acceptation is that which has been adopted by most interpreters. If the practice of preceding translators is ever entitled to implicit regard from their successors, it is where the subject is of so abstruse a nature, as hardly to admit an exposition which is not liable to strong objections. For my part, the difference between *verbum* and *sermo* appears too inconsiderable, in a case of this kind, to induce one to leave the beaten track. Were I to desert it (which I do not think there is here sufficient evidence to warrant,) I should prefer the word *reason,* as suggesting the inward principle or faculty, and not the external enunciation, which may be called *word* or *speech.* Things plausible may be advanced in support of either mode of interpreting. In favour of the common version, *word*, it may be urged, that there is here a manifest allusion to the account given of the creation in the first chapter of Genesis, where we learn, that *God, in the beginning, made all things by his word. God said—and it was so.* In favour of the other interpretation, some have contended, that there is a reference in the expression to the doctrine of the Platonists; whilst others are no less positive, that the sacred author had, in his eye, the sentiments of Philo the Jew. Perhaps these two suppositions amount to

the same thing in effect; at least it is more probable, that the Jewish theorist borrowed his notions on this subject from the Gr. Philosopher, than that the Evangelist should have recourse to an idolater. For my part, I entirely agree with those who think it most likely that the allusion here is to a portion of holy writ, and not to the reveries of either Philo or Plato. The passage of holy writ referred to, is Prov. viii. throughout. What is here termed ὁ λογος, is there ἡ σοφια. There is such a coincidence in the things attributed to each, as evidently shows, that both were intended to indicate the same divine personage. Ths passage in the Proverbs, I own admits a more familiar explanation, as regarding the happy consequences of that mental quality which we may call true or heavenly wisdom. But it is suitable to the genius of scripture prophecy to convey, under such allegorical language, the most important and sublime discoveries. Plausible arguments, therefore, (though not, perhaps, perfectly decisive,) might be urged for rendering λογος, in this passage, *reason*. But as the common rendering, which is also not without its plausibility, has had the concurrent testimony of translators, ancient as well as modern, and seems well adapted to the office of the Messiah, as the oracle and interpreter of God, I thought upon the whole, better to retain it.

[1] *The word was God*, Θεος ην ὁ λογος. The old English translation, authorized by Henry VIII. following the arrangement used in the original, says, *God was the word*. In this manner, Lu. also, in his Ger. translation, renders it **Gott war das wort**. Others maintain, (though, perhaps, the opinion has not been adopted by any translator,) that, as the word Θεος is here without the article, the clause should be, in English, *a God was the word*. But to this, several answers may be given. 1st, It may be argued, that, though the article prefixed shows a noun to be definite, the bare want of the article is not sufficient evidence that the noun is used indefinitely. See verses 6th, 12th, 13th, and 18th, of this chapter; in all which, though the word θεος has no article, there can be no doubt that it means God, in the strictest sense. 2dly, It is a known usage in the language to distinguish the subject in a sentence from what is predicated of it, by prefixing the article to the subject, and giving no article to the predicate. This is observed more carefully when the predicate happens, as in this passage, to be named first. Raphelius has given an excellent example of this from Herodotus,

Νυξ ἡ ἡμερα εγενετο ὁφι μαχομενοιδι, " The day was turned into night before they had done fighting." Here it is only by means of the article that we know this to be the meaning. Take from *ἡμερα* the article, and prefix it to *νυξ*, and the sense will be inverted ; it will be then, *the night was turned into day.*—An example of the same idiom we have from Xenophon's Hellen, in these words, *Ὁ θεος πολλακις χαιρει, τους μεν μικρους μεγαλους ποιων, τους δε μεγαλους μικρους.* Here, though the subject is named before the predicate, it is much more clearly distinguished by the article than by the place, which has not the importance in the Gr. and La. languages that it has in ours. That the same use obtained in the idiom of the synagogue, may be evinced from several passages, particularly from Isa. v. 25. rendered by the Seventy, *Ουαι ὁι λεγοντες το πονηρον καλον, και το καλον πονηρον, ὁι τιθεντες το σκοτος φως, και το φως σκοτος, ὁι τιθεντες το πικρον γλυκυ, και το γλυκυ πικρον.* This is entirely similar to the example from Xenophon. In both, the same words have, and want, the article alternately, as they are made the subject, or the predicate, of the affirmations. I shall add two examples from the N. T. *πνευμα ὁ Θεος*, J. iv. 24. ; and *παντα τα εμα δα εστιν*, L. xv. 31.

3. *All things were made by it ; and without it*——4. *In it was life.* E. T. *All things were made by him ; and without him*——*In him was life.* It is much more suitable to the figurative style here employed, to speak of *the word*, though denoting a person, as a thing, agreeably to the grammatical idiom, till a direct intimation is made of its personality. This intimation I consider as made, verse 4th, *In it was life.* The way of rendering here adopted, is, as far as I have had occasion to observe, agreeable to the practice of all translators, except the English. In the original, the word *λογος*, being in the masculine gender, did not admit a difference in the pronouns. In the Vul. the noun *verbum* is in the neuter gender. Accordingly, we have, in the second verse, *Hoc* (not *hic*) *erat in principio apud Deum.* In most of the oblique cases, both of *hic* and *ipse*, the masculine and the neuter are the same. In Italian, the name is *parola*, which is feminine. Accordingly the feminine pronoun is always used in referring to it. Thus Dio. *Essa era nel principio appo Iddio, Ogni cosa e stata fatta per essa ; e senza essa.* —The same thing may be observed of all the Fr. interpreters who

translate from the Gr. As they render λογος by *parole*, a noun of the feminine gender, the pronoun which refers to it is always *elle*. In Ger. which, in respect of structure, resembles more our own language than either of the former does, the noun wort is neuter. Accordingly, in Luther's translation, the pronoun employed is dasselbige, which is also neuter, and corresponds to *itself*, in Eng. As to English versions, it is acknowledged that all posterior to the common translation have in this implicitly followed it. But it deserves to be remarked that every version which preceded it, as far as I have been able to discover, uniformly employed the neuter pronoun, *it*. So it is in that called the Bishop's Bible, and in the G. E. Beside, that this method is more agreeable to grammatical propriety, it evidently preserves the allusion better which there is in this passage to the account of the creation given by Moses, and suggests more strongly the analogy that subsists between the work of creation and that of redemption, in respect of the same Almighty agent by whom both were carried into execution; for, *by him God also made the worlds*, Heb. i. 2. Add to all this, that the antecedent to the pronoun *it*, can only be *the word;* whereas the antecedent to *him* may be more naturally concluded to be *God*, the nearest noun: in which case, the information given by the Evangelist, verse 3d, amounts to no more than what Moses has given us in the beginning of Genesis, to wit, that God made all things; and what is affirmed in verse 4th, denotes no more than that God is not inanimate matter, the universe, fate, or nature, but a living being endowed with intelligence and power. I believe every candid and judicious reader will admit, that something more was intended by the Evangelist. Nor is there any danger lest the terms should, by one who gives the smallest attention to the attributes here ascribed to *the word*, be too literally understood. Let it be observed further, that the method here taken is that which, in similar cases, is adopted by our translators. Thus it is the same divine personage who, in verse 4th, is called *the light of men;* to which, nevertheless, the pronoun *it* is applied, verse 5th, without hurting our ears in the least.

[2] *Without it, not a single creature was made*, χωρις αυτου εγενετο ουδε ἑν ὁ γεγονεν. Some critics, by a different pointing, cut off the two last words, ὁ γεγονεν, from this sentence, as redundant, and prefix them to the following, making verse 4th run thus.

ὁ γεγονεν εν αυτω ζωη ην. *What was made in it was life.* The Vul. is susceptible of the like difference in meaning, from the different ways of pointing, as the Gr. is. The same may be said of the Sy. and of some other translations both ancient and modern. In languages which do not admit this ambiguity, or in which translators have not chosen to retain it, the general inclination appears to have been to the meaning here assigned. It is urged, in favour of the other, that it is much in John's manner, to begin sentences with the word or words which concluded the sentence immediately preceding. This is true, and we have some instances of it in this chapter; but it is also true, that it is much in the manner of this Evangelist to employ repetitions and tautologies, for the sake of fixing the reader's attention on the sentiments, and rendering them plainer. Of this, the present Gospel, nay, this very chapter, affords examples. Thus, verse 7th, ηλθεν εις μαρτυριον, ινα μαρτυρηση: verse 20th, ωμολογησε:—και ουκ ηρνησατο, και ωμολογησεν.—Admitting, therefore, that both interpretations were equally favoured by the genius of the tongue, and the Apostle's manner of writing, the common interpretation is preferable, because simpler and more perspicuous. The apparent repetition in this verse is supposed, not implausibly, to suggest, that not only the matter of the world was produced, but every individual being was formed by the word.

5. *The light shone in darkness, but the darkness admitted it not,* το φως εν τη σκοτια φαινει· και ἡ σκοτια αυτο ου κατελαβεν. E. T. *The light shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not.* Nothing is a more distinguishing particularity of this writer's style, than the confounding of the tenses. It is evident, from the connexion of these clauses, that the tense ought to be the same in both. And though it might admit some defence that, in clauses connected as those in the text, the first should be expressed in the past, and the second in the present, the reverse is surely, on the principles of grammar, indefensible. I have employed the past time in both, as more suitable to the strain of the context. I think also it makes a clearer sense; inasmuch as the passage alludes to the reception which Jesus Christ, here called the light, met with, whilst he abode upon the earth, and the mistakes of all his countrymen (the disciples themselves not excepted) in regard to his office and character.

9. *The true light was he who*—*Hv το φως αληθινον ὁ*—E. T. *That was the true light which*—When this verse, in the original, is compared with the foregoing, it appears, upon the first glance, to be in direct contradiction to it: verse 8th, *ουκ ην εκεινος το φως*; verse 9th, *ην το φως*. As if we should say, in Eng. *that man was not the light*——*He was the light.* But, on attending more closely, we find that, in verse 8th, *εκεινος*, referring to John the Baptist, is the subject of the proposition; whereas, in verse 9th, *το φως* is the subject. In this view, there is a perfect consistency between the two assertions, as they relate to different subjects. For the greater perspicuity, I have rendered what is affirmed of the true light, verse 9th, *he who coming*, not *that which coming*, though this is the more literal version. My reason is, because, in the following verses, this light is spoken of always as a person. Now, the best place for introducing this change of manner, is doubtless that wherein an explanation is purposely given of the phrase *το φως το αγηθινον*. And that there is such a change of manner in the original, is manifest. Thus the pronoun referring to *φως*, verse 5th, is *αυτο*, in the neuter; but, after the explanation given, verse 9th, we find in verses 10th, 11th, and 12th, *αυτον*, in the masculine.

[2] *Who, coming into the world, enlighteneth every man, ὁ φωτιζει παντα ανθρωπον ερχομενον εις τον κοσμον.* E. T. *Which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.* Vul. *Quæ illuminat omnem hominen venientem in hunc mundum.* I have observed (Diss. XII. P. I. § 22.) that the word *ερχομενον*, in this place, is equivocal, as it may be understood to agree either with *φως* or with *ανθρωπον*. As the ambiguity could not well be preserved in Eng. I have preferred the former method of rendering. Most modern translators, Itn. Fr. and Ger. as well as ours, have, with the Vul. preferred the latter. The former way has been adopted by Cas. and Leo de Juda, in La.; by L. Cl. and Beau. in Fr.; by the An. translator and Dod. in Eng. The reasons which determined my choice, are the following: 1st, *Ὁ ερχομενος εις τον κοσμον*, is a periphrasis by which the Messiah was at that time commonly denoted [as ch. vi. 14. xviii. 37.]. 2dly, He is in this Gospel once and again distinguished as *the light that cometh into the world.* Thus, ch. iii. 19. *Now this is the condemnation, that the light (το φως) is come into the world*:—ch. xii. 46. *I am come a light into the world.* 3dly, I do not find,

on the other hand, that ερχομενος εις κοσμον, *who cometh into the world*, is ever employed by the sacred writers as an addition to πας ανθρωπος, *every man*. I am far from pretending that words, not absolutely necessary, are not sometimes used in Scripture to render the expression more forcible. But it must be allowed to have weight in the present case, that a phrase, which never occurs in the application that suits the common version, is familiar in the application that suits the version given here. 4thly, The meaning conveyed in this version appears more consonant to fact than the other. To say that the Messiah, by coming into the world, lighteth every man, is, in my apprehension, no more than to say that he has, by his coming, rendered the spiritual light of his Gospel accessible to all, without distinction, who choose to be guided by it. The other, at least, seems to imply, that every individual has in fact been enlightened by him. Markland observes (Bowyer's conjectures,) that if ερχομενον agreed with ανθρωπον, it would have probably had the article, and been τον ερχομενον. But on this I do not lay stress; for though the remark is founded in the Gr. idiom, such minute circumstances are not always minded by the Evangelists.

11. *He came to his own home, and his own family did not receive him*, εις τα ιδια ηλθε, και οι ιδιοι αυτον ου παρελαβον. E. T. *He came unto his own, and his own received him not.* The E.T. is right, as far as it goes, but not so explicit as the original. The distinction made by the author between τα ιδια and οι ιδιοι, is overlooked by the interpreter. As by that distinction the country of Judea, and the people of the Jews, are more expressly marked, I have thought it worthy of being retained. For a similar phrase to εις τα ιδια, see L. ii. 49. N. Though τα ιδια commonly means *home*, this is not always to be understood strictly for *one's own house*. A man naturally considers his *country*, when he is at a distance from it, as his *home*, and his *countrymen*, as those of his *family*. Diss. XII. P. IV. § 8.

12, 13. *Children of God, who derive their birth not from blood.* That is, children by a generation spiritual and divine, which has nothing in common with natural generation.

14. *The word became incarnate*, ο λογος σαρξ εγενετο. E. T. *The word was made flesh.* In the language of the synagogue, the

term σαρξ was so often employed to denote *a human being*, that the Evangelist's expression would not sound so harshly in the ears of those accustomed to that idiom, as the literal version of the words does in ours. Besides, *was made* does not entirely correspond to εγενετο as used here, being a translation rather of the La. *factum est*, than of the Gr. I have for these reason preferred the phrase *became incarnate*, which, if it does not so much trace the letter of the original as the common rendering does, is closer to the sense, and sufficiently simple and intelligible. This expression, *The word became incarnate* has been thought by some, not implausibly, to have been pointed by the Evangelist against the error of the *Docetæ*, who denied the human nature of Christ, supposing him to have been a man only in appearance; and the expression, *The word was God*, v. 1. to have been pointed against the error of the Ebionites, who denied his divine nature, affirming that he was no more than a man.

[a] *Sojourned*, εσκηνωσεν. E. T. *Dwelt.* Vul. Ar. Er. Zu. Cas. *Habitavit.* Be. *Commoratus est.* Most foreign versions follow the Vul. An. *Had his tabernacle.* Dod. *Pitched his tabernacle.* Wes. and Wy. *Tabernacled.* The rest follow the common version. The primitive signification of the verb σκηνοω, from σκηνη *tent* or *tabernacle*, is, doubtless, *to pitch a tent*, or *dwell in a tent.* But words come insensibly to deviate from their first signification. This has evidently happened to the verb in question. As a tent, from its nature, must be a habitation of but short continuance, the verb formed from it would quickly come to signify to reside for a little time, more as a sojourner than as an inhabitant. This is well deduced by Phavorinus, σκηνη, ἡ προσκαιρος κατοικια· σκηνοω, το προς καιρον οικησιν ποιουμαι, which exactly suits the sense of *commoror, I sojourn.* It must be owned also (as may be evinced from unexceptionable authorities,) that the verb means sometimes simply *to dwell*, in the largest sense, without any limitation from the nature, or the duration, of the dwelling. Thus the inhabitants of heaven are called (Rev. xii. 12. and xiii. 6.) οι εν ουρανοις σκηνουντες. Nay, which is still stronger, it is made use of to express God's abode with his people after the resurrection, which is always represented as eternal, Rev. xxi. 3. But we may be the less surprised at this, when we consider that σκηνη itself is used (Lu. xvi. 9.) for a permanent habitation, and joined with the epithet αιωνιος. See N. 3. on that

verse. We cannot, therefore deny that the manner wherein the word is rendered by the Vul. and the E. T. is entirely defensible. As the term, however, admits either interpretation; and as the word for *to dwell* commonly used in this Gospel, and even in this chapter, is different; and as, considering the shortness of our Lord's life, especially of his ministry, he may be said more properly to have *sojourned* than to have *dwelt* amongst us; I have preferred Be.'s interpretation.

15. I look upon this verse as a parenthesis, in which the testimony of John is anticipated, verse 16th being in immediate connexion with verse 14th. It is for this reason I have not only enclosed verse 15th in hooks, but introduced it by the words *it was*, which render the connexion closer. This will appear more evidently from what is to be remarked on verse 16th.

[2] *Is preferred to me*, εμπροσθεν μου γεγονεν. Vul. *Ante me factus est.* Er. and Zu. *Antecessit me.* Cas. *Ante me fuit.* Be. *Antepositus est mihi.* Dio. *M'e antiposto.* G. F. *Est preferé a moi.* L. Cl. *Est plus que moi.* Beau. *M'est préféré.* Ger. **vor mir gewesen ist.** E. T. Dod. Hey. Wes. Wy. Wor. *Is preferred before me.* An. *Was before me.* There are but two meanings in all the variety of expressions employed in translating this passage. Some make it express *priority* in time, others *pre-eminence* in dignity. With the former we should undoubtedly class the Vul. and yet most of those who have translated from it, must be numbered among the latter. Thus the translators of P. R. and Sa. say, *A été préféré a moi.* Si. *Est au dessus de moi.* But, though the Vul. and the other Latin translators, Be. alone excepted, have adopted the first method; all the translators into modern languages I am acquainted with, Romish or Protestant (except Lu. the An. and the Rh.), have followed Be. in preferring the second. Were I here translating the Vul. I should certainly say with the interpreters of Rheims, *was made before me*, and should be ready to employ Si.'s language against himself, accusing him (with better reason than he has accused Be. and the P. R. interpreters) of giving for a version, a mere comment which ought to have been put in the margin. But, as I do not translate from the Vul. the case is different. Wh. indeed, a commentator of known and deserved reputation, thinks the proper import of εμπροσθεν to be *before in time*, and renders the Gr. expression *is before me.* "I find no instance," says he,

" where εμπροσθεν μου γεγονεν signifies, he was preferred before me, and therefore rather choose to retain the proper import of the words." Maldonat, another commentator, justly celebrated for critical abilities and acuteness, is of an opinion directly opposite to Wh.'s. He affirms, that in Scripture εμπροσθεν never expresses priority of time. " Ut multi notaverunt, non dixit προ μου, sed εμπροσθεν μου ; præpositio autem εμπροσθεν nusquam in sacris literis reperitur tempus significare." Be. appears to have thought so also when he said, " Ego istos libenter rogem, ut vel unum ex Novi Testamenti libris exemplum proferant in quo εμπροσθεν tempus declaret." Opinions so contrary cannot be both true ; but both may be false, and I suspect are so. That εμπροσθεν in the New Testament is sometimes expressive of time, may be argued from these words of the Baptist, ch. iii. 28. *I am not the Messiah, but am sent before him.* εμπροσθεν εκεινου. There is at the same time, it must be confessed, some relation to place here also. The word εμπροσθεν in the most common acceptation, answers to the Latin *coram*, not seldom to *præ*, more rarely to *ante*. In the sense of preference or superiority, it is, doubtless, employed by the Seventy, Gen. xlviii. 20. εθηκεν τον Εφραιμ εμπροσθεν του Μανασσε, *He set Ephraim before Manasseh :* for though it may be said that Ephraim was the first named, it is only the preference implied as given to the younger brother, which seems to have been regarded by their father Joseph. Chrysostom also, and other Gr. expositors, interpret in the same manner the words in the passage under consideration. Add to this that, in those places of the Gospel, which are pretty numerous, where priority in time alone is referred to, the word is never εμπροσθεν, but either προ or πριν, with the genitive of the noun, or the infinitive of the verb. See in this Gospel (amongst other places) ch. i. 48. iv. 49. v. 7. viii. 58. Another argument in favour of this interpretation is, that priority in time appears to be marked by the succeeding clause πρωτος μου ην, to be considered immediately. Now to give the same meaning to both clauses, is to represent the Evangelist as recurring to a sophism which logicians call *idem per idem*, that is, proving a thing by itself, repeated with only some variety in the expression ; insomuch that his reasoning would amount to no more than this, *He was before me, because he was before me.*

3 *For he was before me, ότι πρωτος μου ην.* Vul. Er. Zu. Be. *Quia prior me erat.* Cas. *Quippe qui prior me sit.* The Sy. (though, in the former clause, the expression may be thought ambiguous) is clearly to the same purpose, with the aforesaid versions in this. In the same manner also Dio. Lu. and the Fr. translators, except Beau. who says, *Parce qu'il est plus grand que moi.* With this agrees Hey. *For he is my superior.* The other Eng. versions concur with the E. T. The word *πρωτος* is no doubt a superlative and signifies not only first in time, but often also first in dignity and rank. When it is used in this way, it is commonly followed, like other superlatives, by the genitive plural of that which is the subject of comparison ; or, if the subject be expressed by a collective noun, by the genitive singular. Thus (Mr. xii. 29.) *πρωτη παδων των εντολων* is *the chief of all the commandments*, (Acts xxviii. 17.) *τους οντας των Ιουδαιων πρωτους, the chief of the Jews.* In like manner (Mr. vi. 21.) *οι πρωτοι της Γαλιλαιας*, and (L. xix. 47.) *οι πρωτοι του λαου ;* for *λαος* is a collective noun, so also is *Γαλιλαια* the name of a country, when used by a trope for the inhabitants. But in the expression in question, there is neither collective nor genitive plural ; *πρωτος* cannot therefore be rightly understood as a superlative. But is there any similar example in the sacred writers ? There is one similar in this very Gospel (xv. 18.), *εμε πρωτον υμων μεμισηκεν*, concerning the meaning of which, though the construction is unusual, there has hardly been, till very lately, a diversity of opinion amongst interpreters. These have generally agreed in rendering the passage, *it hated me before it hated you.* The sense which has been put on the word *πρωτος*, and so strenuously defended by Dr. Lardner, shall be considered in the note on that place. Till then I shall take it for granted that what has hitherto been the commonest explanation of the term, is also the clearest. Now, by every principle of sound criticism, we ought to explain the doubtful by the clear, especially as both examples, which are all the examples that Scripture affords us, are from the same pen ; and as the passage thus explained yields a sense which is both just and apposite, there being at least an apparent reference to the information he had given us concerning the *λογος, the word*, in the beginning of the chapter.

16. *Of his fulness we all have received, even grace for his grace. Εκ του πληρωματος αυτου ημεις παντες ελαβομεν, και χαριν αντι*

χαριτος. E. T. *Of his fulness have all we received, and grace for grace.* The context shows that the possessive pronoun αυτου, *his*, refers to ὁ λογος, *the word*, which, he says, became incarnate. But what is the import of the clause *grace for grace?* Is it that we receive grace, in return for the grace we give? So says L. Cl. availing himself of an ambiguity in the Gr. word χαρις, which (like *grace* in Fr.) signifies not only a favour bestowed, but thanks returned; and maintaining that the sense is, that God gives more *grace* to those who are thankful for that formerly received; a position which, however just, it requires an extraordinary turn of imagination to discover in this passage. Is it, as Dod. Wes. and Wy. render it, *grace upon grace*, that is, grace added to grace? I should not dislike this interpretation, if this meaning of the preposition αντι in Scripture, were well supported. It always there denotes, if I mistake not, *instead of*, *answering to*, or *in return for*. Is it a mere pleonasm? Does it mean (as Grotius would have it) *grace gratuitous?* I do not say that such pleonastic expressions are unexampled in sacred writ; but I do say, that this sense given to the idiom is unexampled. The word in such cases is δωρεαν, as Rom. iii. 4. Δικαιουμενοι δωρεαν τη αυτου χαριτι. If, instead of giving scope to fancy, we attend to the context and the construction of the words, we shall not need to wander so far in quest of the meaning. In verse 14th we are informed, that *the word became incarnate, and sojourned amongst us full of grace and truth.* It is plain that the 15th verse, containing the Baptist's declaration, must be understood as a parenthesis. And it actually is understood so by all expositors; inasmuch as they make αυτου here refer to λογος in verse 14th. The Evangelist resuming the subject, which, (for the sake of inserting John's testimony,) he had interrupted, tells us that all we his disciples, particularly his apostles, have received of his *fulness*. But of what was he full? It had been said expressly, that he was *full of grace*. When, therefore, the historian brings this additional clause concerning *grace* in explanation of the former (for on all hands the conjunction και is here admitted to be explanatory,) is it not manifestly his intention to inform us, that of every *grace* wherewith he was filled, his disciples received a share? The pronoun αυτου, which occurs after πληρωματος, must be understood as repeated after χαριτος, the omission whereof in such cases is so common as

scarcely to be considered as an ellipsis. I shall give a few similar examples out of many which might be produced, Mt. xii. 50. *αυτος μου αδελφος, και αδελφη, και μητηρ εστι ;* where the pronoun *μου* is prefixed to the first noun, and left to be supplied by the sense before the other two. 1 Tim. vi. 1. *ινα μη το ονομα του Θεου και η διδασκαλια βλασφημηται ;* where the sense requires the pronoun *αυτου*, or the repetition of *του Θεου* after *διδασκαλια ;* and to give one example from this Gospel, ch. vi. 52. *πως δυναται ουτος ημιν δουναι την σαρκα φαγειν ;* where, if we do not supply from the sense *αυτου* after *σαρκα*, we shall give a very different meaning to the question, and one perfectly unsuited to the context. But to return to the words under examination ; when the immediate connexion between the 16th and the 14th verses is attended to, the meaning of the clause is equally obvious as that of any of the foregoing examples. *The word incarnate*, says the Apostle, *resided amongst us full of grace and truth ; and of his fulness we all have received, even grace for his grace ;* that is, of every grace or celestial gift, conferred above measure upon him, his disciples have received a portion, according to their measure. If there should remain a doubt, whether this were the sense of the passage, the words immediately following seem calculated to remove it. *For the law was given by Moses, the grace and the truth came by Jesus Christ.* Here the Evangelist intimates that Jesus Christ was as truly the channel of divine grace to his disciples, as Moses had been of the knowledge of God's law to the Israelites. I am happy to find that in this criticism I concur with the learned Dr. Clarke.

17. *The grace and the truth, η χαρις και η αληθεια.* E. T. *grace and truth.* The article in this place ought by no means to be omitted. These nouns are often used emphatically as names for the gospel dispensation ; and are here contrasted as such to *ο νομος the law*, the name given to the Mosaic economy. *Η χαρις* sometimes with, and sometimes without, an addition, is thus, if I mistake not, employed in these and other passages, which the reader may consult at his leisure ; Acts, xiii. 43. xx. 32. 2 Cor. vi. 1. Gal. ii. 21. v. 4. 2 Thess. i. 12. Tit. ii. 11. 1 Pet. v. 12. ; and *η αληθεια* in the following, J. viii. 32. xvi. 13. xvii. 17. 2 Cor. iv. 2. xiii. 8. Gal. iii. 1. v. 7. Eph. iv. 21. 2 Thess. ii. 12. 1 Tim. iii. 15. iv. 3. 2 Tim. ii. 15. iii. 8. iv. 4. Tit. i. 14. Heb. x. 26. Ja. v. 19. 1 Pet. i. 22. 2 Pet. ii. 2. 1 J. ii. 21. 2 J. 2. 3 J. 8.

18. *That is in the bosom of the Father*, ch. iii. 13. N.

19. *Now this is the testimony of John.* *Και αυτη εστιν η μαρτυρια του Ιωαννου.* A little attention to the words in the original will convince the judicious reader that there ought to be a full stop here, and that this ought to be read as a distinct sentence. The next sentence, which includes the rest of the 19th verse, and the whole of the 20th, derives both simplicity and perspicuity from this manner of dividing.

21. *Who then? τι ουν;* E T. *What then?* Between the two questions, *What art thou?* and *Who art thou?* put on such an occasion as the present, by such men as the messengers of the Pharisees, to such a person as John, there is no imaginable difference, in respect of meaning. Accordingly the same answer is equally adapted to either question. But there is in our language an essential difference in meaning between the words *What then?* and *Who then?* The former, though it would be readily denominated a literal version of the Gr. *τι ουν*, conveys to our mind a sense totally different: the latter, with an inconsiderable difference in point of form, entirely coincides in import with the original expression; for in such cases, as was just now observed, *what* and *who* are equivalent. But in combining words into a phrase, the result is often different from what we should expect from the words, of which the phrase is combined, considered severally. And this is one of the many reasons which render a literal verson often a very unjust as well as obscure version. As to the point we are here concerned with, *what then?* has acquired an idiomatical acceptation which answers exactly to the Fr. *Qu'inferez vous de la? What would you infer from that?* than which nothing could be more foreign to the purpose. I am surprised that all the later Eng. versions, except the An. who omits the question entirely, have here implictly followed the E. T. The foreign translators have in general done justice to the sense.

[2] *Art thou Elijah? He said, I am not.* There is here an apparent contradiction to the words of our Lord concerning John, Mt. xi. 14. *This is the Elijah that was to come.* But Jesus, in the passage quoted, evidently refers to the words of Malachi, his purpose being to inform his disciples that John was Elijah, in the meaning of that Prophet, and that the Prophet's prediction

was accomplished in the Baptist, inasmuch as he came in the spirit and power of Elijah. But when the question was proposed to John, the laws of truth required that he should answer it, according to the sense wherein the words were used by the proposers. He could not otherwise have been vindicated from the charge of equivocating. The intended purport of their question, he well knew, was, whether he acknowledged that he was individually the Prophet Elijah returned from heaven to sojourn again upon the earth; for, in this manner they explained the prediction. To this he could not, without falsehood, answer in the affirmative.

[3] *Art thou the prophet?* ὁ προφητης ει συ; E. T. *Art thou that prophet?* The latter expression is evidently unsuitable to our idiom, unless some prophet had been named in the preceding part of the conversation, to whom the pronoun *that* could refer. In this our translators have too implicitly followed Be. who says, *Es tu propheta ille?* Not that I condemn Be. for this version. I think, on the contrary, that as the article was quite necessary here, and this was the only way of supplying it in La. he did right. Accordingly Er. and Leo de Juda had done the same before him. But there was no occasion for this method in Eng. which has articles. I own, at the same time, that in the way wherein the question is expressed in the Vul. and in Cas. the most natural version would be, *Art thou a prophet?* which is quite a different question: nay, I am persuaded that, if this had been the question, the Baptist's answer would not have been in the negative. Our Lord, we know, calls him (Mt. xi. 11.) *a prophet than whom there had not arisen a greater* under tke Mosaic dispensation. Besides, the Gr. is quite explicit, and the article here perfectly well supported. It is also repeated with the word προφητης, verse 25th, and of the best authority, notwithstanding the dissent of Heinsius and Mill. Yet some translators, even from the Gr. have rendered the question indefinitely. Of this number are Lu. and Beau. among foreigners, and of Eng. translators the An. Dod. and Wor. To me it is evident, both from what is said here, and from other hints in the N. T. that there was at that time a general expectation in the people, of some great prophet, beside Elijah, who was soon to appear, and who was well known by the emphatical appellation *the prophet*, with-

out any addition or description. In ch. vi. 40, 41, *the prophet* is distinguished from the Messiah, as he is here from Elijah.

23. *I am he whose voice proclaimeth in the wilderness*, *Εγω φωνη βοωντος εν τη ερημω.* E. T. *I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness.* In such declarations the general purport is alone regarded by the speaker ; the words ought not, therefore, to be too grammatically interpreted. John, instead of giving a description of his own character and office, refers those who questioned him, to the words of the prophet Isaiah, in which they would find it. What he here says of himself, is to be understood no otherwise than we understand what Mt. says of him, ch. iii. 3. Interpretations to be formed from the manifest scope, not from the syntactic structure, of a sentence, are not unfrequent in scripture. Thus. Rev. i. 12. *Επεστρεψα βλεπειν την φωνην*, literally, *I turned to see the voice.*—The like may be observed in some of the parables, as Mt. xiii. 24. and 45. In one of these places the kingdom of heaven is, according to the scope of the passage, compared to a field ; but, according to the letter, to the proprietor : in the other it is compared, apparently, to a merchant, but in fact to a pearl. Several other instances occur in the Gospels. As on such points, the genius of modern languages is more fastidious than that of the ancient, it would savour more of the superstitious and servile spirit of the synagogue, or of the *κακοζηλια* of an Arias or an Aquila, than of the liberal spirit of our religion, to insist on a version of these passages scrupulously literal.

28. *Bethany.* E. T. *Bethabara.* In the common Gr. it is *Βηθαβαρα.* But the MSS. which read *Βηθανια*, are, both in number and in value, more than a counterpoise to those in which we find the vulgar reading. Add to these the Vul. the Sax. and both the Sy. versions, together with Nonnus' Gr. paraphrase of this Gospel, which is entitled to be put on the footing of an ancient translation. Also several ancient authors, and some of the best editions, read so. There is ground to think that the change of *Bethany* into *Bethabara*, took its rise from a conjecture of Origen, who, because its situation mentioned here does not suit what is said of Bethany, where Lazarus and his sisters lived, changed it into Bethabara, the place mentioned, Judg. vii. 24. where our translators have rendered it Beth-barah. But one thing is cer-

tain, that, in several instances, the same name was given to different places, and this *Bethany* seems here to be expressly distinguished from another of the name, by the addition *πιραν του Ιορδανου, upon the Jordan.* It adds also to the probability of the reading here adopted, that *Bethany,* by its etymology, signifies a place or house close by a ferry.

33. *I should not have known him.* This has been thought by some not perfectly consistent with what L. acquaints us concerning the connexion of their families, and particularly with what we are told, Mt. iii. 14. ; where we find, that John, when Jesus came to him to be baptized, modestly declined the office, and freely acknowledged the superiority of the latter. But there is no absurdity in supposing that this was in consequence of what the Baptist knew concerning our Lord's personal character, his superior wisdom and sanctity. Nay, he might have known further, that he was a Prophet, and highly honoured of God, and yet not have known or even suspected, that he was the Messiah, till the descent of the Holy Ghost at his baptism. All that is affirmed here is, that, till this evidence was given him, he did not know him to be the Messiah. The same solution of this difficulty is given, I find, by Mr. Palmer. See his letter prefixed to Priestley's Harmony.

41. *A name equivalent to Christ, ὁ ἐστι μεθερμηνευομενον ὁ Χριστος.* E. T. *Which is, being interpreted, the Christ.* In all the best MSS. and editions, the article in Gr. before *Χριστος* is wanting. As the intention here is only to point out the coincidence of the two names, we must be sensible that it was not necessary.

43. *Cephas, which denoteth the same as Peter, Κηφας ὁ ἑρμηνευεται Πετρος.* E. T. *Cephas, which is by interpretation a stone.* I have put *which denoteth the same as Peter,* in a different character, as the words of the historian, and not of our Lord. We ought to consider that this Evangelist wrote his Gospel in a Grecian city of Asia Minor, and, for this reason, was the more careful to translate into Gr. the Heb. or Chal. names, given for a special purpose, whereof they were expressive. There was the greater reason for doing so in the two cases occurring in this and the preceding verse, as the Greek names were become familiar to the Asiatic converts, who were unacquainted with the Oriental

names. The sacred writer had a twofold view in it; first, to explain the import of the name; secondly, to prevent his readers from mistaking the persons spoken of. They all knew who, as well as what, was meant by *Christos;* but not by the Heb. word *Messiah.* In like manner they knew who was called *Peter*, but might very readily mistake *Cephas* for some other person. When a significant name was given to a man or woman, it was customary to translate the name, when he or she was spoken of in a different tongue. Thus, *Thomas* was in Gr. *Didymus*; and *Tabitha* was *Dorcas.* Now, it deserves our notice, that a translator from the Gr can, for the most part, answer only one of the two purposes above mentioned. The Gr. to those who cannot read it, is equally unintelligible with the Heb. To give the Gr. name, therefore, to the Eng. reader, is not to explain the Heb. For this reason, the interpreter ought to consider which of the two purposes suits best the scope of the place, and to be directed, by this consideration, in his version. The other purpose he may supply by means of the margin. To me it appears of more importance, in these instances, to be ascertained of the sameness of the person denominated both *Messiah* and *Christ*, and also of him called *Cephas* and *Peter*, than to know that the two former words signify *anointed*, and the two latter *rock.* I have, therefore, taken the method adopted by the Eng. translators as to the former, but not as to the latter. They have retained *Christ* in the version and put *anointed* on the margin. The word *Petros* they have translated *a stone.* The same way ought certainly to have been followed in both. As far as I can judge of the scope of the passage, it is clearly the intention of the writer, on the first mention of some principal persons in his history, in order to prevent all mistakes that may, in the sequel, arise about them, to give their different names at once, with this intimation, that they are of the same import, and belong to the same person. Thus, we have here, in one verse, all the names by which this Apostle is distinguished—*Simon*, son of *Jonah*, *Cephas* and *Peter.* Again, if the sacred penman had more in view, to acquaint us with the signification of the name, than to prevent our mistaking the person, he would probably have translated Cephas into Gr. πετρα, not Πετρος. The former is always used in the N. T. and in the Sep. for *a rock*, and never the latter. I

acknowledge that *πετρος*, in Gr. authors, and *πετρα*, are synonymous; but, in the use of the sacred writers, *Πετρος* is invariably, and *πετρα* never a proper name. Nay, in the passage, Mt. xvi. 18. wherein the signification of the word is pointed out, as the reason of assigning the name, the word is changed in the explanation given—*συ ει Πετρος· και επι ταυτη τη πετρα*. This would not have been done, if *Πετρος* had ever been used by them for *a rock*. Accordingly, in the Sy. version, there is no change of the word; Cephas, or rather Kepha, serving equally for both. The change was evidently made in the Gr. for the sake of the gender; *πετρα*, being feminine, was not a suitable name for a man. The word *Πετρος*, however, being preferred by the Evangelist to *πετρα*, shows evidently that it was more his view to indicate the person, than to explain the name. So the author of the Vul. understood it, who renders the words *quod interpretatur Petrus*, not *petra*. Let it be observed further, that this Apostle is never afterwards named by this Evangelist *Cephas*, but always Peter. Now, in consequence of excluding that name out of this verse, the very purpose, as I imagine, of John's introducing the name into it, is defeated; as, from this Gospel at least, the mere Eng. reader would not discover, when he hears afterwards of Peter, that it was the same person whom our Saviour, on this occasion, denominated Cephas. It must, therefore, be more eligible to preserve the names in the version, and give their import in the margin, than conversely; unless we will say, that it is of more consequence to know the etymology of the names, than to be secured against mistaking the persons to whom they are appropriated. I shall only add, that, by a strange felicity in some tongues, both purposes are answered in the translation, as well as in the original. *Pierre*, in Fr. hits both senses exactly; and in La. and Itn. the affinity in the names is as great as between *πετρος* and *πετρα*, in Gr.

51. *Thou believest*, *πιστευεις*. E. T. *Believest thou?* The words are capable of being translated either way. I prefer the more simple method of rendering, which is by affirmation, when neither the form of the sentence, nor any expression of surprise or emotion, lead us to consider it as an interrogation.

52. *Hereafter*, *απ' αρτι*. There is nothing answering to this in the Vul. Cop. Sax. and Arm. versions. The words are wanting in but one MS. of no great account.

CHAPTER II.

4. *Woman.* That this compellation was not, in those days, accounted disrespectful, has been fully evinced by critics from the best authorities. We find in this Gospel (ch. xix. 26.) our Lord addressing his mother by this title on a very moving occasion, on which he showed her the most tender affection and regard.

4 *What hast thou to do with me?* Mt. viii. 29. N. It was no doubt our Lord's intention, in these words, gently to suggest that, in what concerned his office, earthly parents had no authority over him. In other things, he had been subject to them. Some translators have been rather over-solicitous to accommodate the expression to modern forms of civility. The An. *Leave that affair to me; is not that my concern?* Hey. *What is there between me and you?* This, I suppose, has been thought a softer expression of the sense than that which is given in the E. T. It is certainly more obscure, and does not suit our idiom. But it is a literal version of the phrase, by which the Fr. translators render our Lord's expression—*Qu' y a-t-il entre vous et moi?* Wes. *What is it to me and thee?* This, at first sight, appears preferable to the rest, because the most literal version. But, as Bishop Pearce well observes, had that been the Evangelist's meaning, he would have written τι προς εμε και σε; as in ch. xxi. 23. τι προς σε; *what is that to thee?* and, Mt. xxvii. 4. τι προς ἡμας; *what is that to us?* Let me add, that τι εμοι και σοι, as it is elliptic, is evidently a proverbial or idiomatic expression. Now, the meaning of such is always collected from the customary application of the words taken together, and not from combining the significations of the words taken severally. The common version suits the phrase in every place where it occurs—Wesley's does not; accordingly, in all other places, he renders it differently. Another reason against this manner is, because the sense conveyed by it is a worse sense, and not suitable to the spirit of our Lord's instructions. 'What is it to us, that they want wine? That concerns them only; let them see to it.' This way of talking appears rather selfish, and does not savour of that tender sympathy which

our religion so warmly recommends, whereby the interests and the concerns of others, their joys and their sorrows, are made our own.

6. *Baths*, μετρητας. E. T. *Firkins.* As to the impropriety of introducing into a version of Scripture the name of a vessel so modern as *firkin*, see Diss. VIII. P. I. § 9, &c. I have preferred here the Heb. measure, *bath*, as the common standard used in reckoning the capacity of their vessels; especially as I find the Heb. word בת rendered μετρητης, in the Sep. 2 Chron. iv. 5. I acknowledge, at the same time, that this evidence it not decisive; but I have not found any thing better, in support of a different opinion. The Seventy, indeed, have, in 1 Kings, xviii. 32. rendered סאה *seah*, which was equal to one third of the *bath*, in the same manner; but, as the words *seah* and *ephah* were, with the Hebrews, peculiarly the names of dry measures, and never applied to liquids, we cannot have recourse to that passage for the interpretation of an expression relating solely to liquors. Some think that, as μετρητης was also the name of an Attic measure, the Evangelist (most of whose readers were probably Greeks) must have referred to it, as best known in that country. There are other suppositions made; but hardly any thing more than conjecture has been advanced in favour of any of them. It ought not to be dissembled, that, in most of the explanations which have been given of the passage, the quantity of liquor appears so great, as to reflect an improbability on the interpretation. I shall only say, that the E. T. is more liable to this objection than the present version. The *firkin* contains nine gallons; the *bath* is commonly rated at seven and a half, some say but four and a half; in which case the amount of the whole, as represented here, is but half of what the E. T. makes it. The quantity thus reduced, will not, perhaps, be thought so enormous, when we consider, first, the length of time, commonly a week, spent in feasting on such occasions (of which time, possibly, one half was not yet over), and the great concourse of people which they were wont to assemble.

[2] *For the Jewish rites of cleansing*, κατα τον καθαρισμον των Ιουδαιων. E. T. *After the manner of the purifying of the Jews.* This expression is rather obscure and indefinite. There can be

no doubt that, in such cases as the present, κατα is equivalent to εις, and denotes the end or purpose. So the Sy. interpreter has understood it.

10. *When the guests have drunk largely,* ὁταν μεθυσθωσι. Vul. *Cum inebriati fuerint.* The Gr. word, frequently in Scripture, and sometimes in other writings, denotes no more than *to drink freely*, but not to intoxication.

14. *Cattle,* βοας. E. T. *Oxen.* Βους in Gr. in like manner as *bos* in La. is the name of the species, and therefore of the common gender. It includes alike *bulls*, *cows*, and *oxen.* Thus, Gen. xli. 2, 3. the *kine* in Pharao's dream are termed βοες by the Seventy—επτα βοες καλαι—αλλαι επτα βοες αισχραι—and in the Vul. they are named *boves* ; but no person who understands Eng. would call them *oxen.* And though a herd may sometimes be so denominated, because the *oxen* make the greater part, it could never, with propriety, be used of cattle amongst which there was not even a single *ox.* Let it be observed, that the merchandize, which was carried on in the outermost court of the temple, a very unsuitable place, without doubt, was under the pretext of being necessary for the accommodation of the worshippers, that they might be supplied with the victims requisite for the altar ; and, where payments in money were necessary, that, in exchange for the foreign coin they may have brought from their respective places of abode, they might be furnished with such as the law and custom required. Now, by the law of Moses, no mutilated beast, and consequently no *ox*, could be offered in sacrifice to God. Yet all the English translators I have seen, render βοας here *oxen.* In like manner, all the Fr. translators I am acquainted with, except Beau. who says, *des taureaux*, fall into the same mistake, rendering the word *des bœufs.*

20. *Forty and six years was this temple in building.* τεσσαρακοντα και εξ ετεσιν ωκοδομηθη ὁ ναος ουτος. Dod. Hey. and Wor. say *hath been*, instead of *was*, proceeding on the supposition, that those who made this reply alluded to the additional buildings which the temple had received, and which had been begun by Herod, and continued by those who succeeded him in the government of Judea, to the time then present. But let it be observed, that the Jews never did, nor do, to this day, speak of more than

two temples possessed by their fathers; the first built by Solomon, the second by Zerubbabel. The great additions made by Herod, were considered as intended only for decorating and repairing the edifice, not for rebuilding it; for, in fact, Zerubbabel's temple had not then been destroyed. Nor need we, I think, puzzle ourselves to make out exactly the *forty-six years* spoken of. Those men were evidently in the humour of exaggerating, in order to represent to the people as absurd, what they had immediately heard advanced by our Lord. In this disposition, we may believe, they would not hesitate to include the years in which the work was interrupted, among the years employed in building.

22. *That he had said this*, ὁτι τουτο ελεγεν. In the common editions, *αυτοις*, *to them*, is added. But this word is wanting in a very great number of MSS. amongst which are several of the highest account. It is not in some of the best editions, nor in the following versions: the Vul. either of the Sy. Cop. Arm. Sax. Ger. Tigurine, old Belgic. It has not been admitted by the best critics, ancient or modern.

[2] *They understood the Scripture and the word*, επιστευσαν τη γραφη και τω λογω. E. T. *They believed the Scripture and the word.* *Πιστευειν*, in the sacred writers, sometimes signifies, not so much *to believe*, as *to apprehend* aright. In this sense, it is once and again employed by this writer in particular. It is not insinuated here, that the disciples did not, before this time, *believe* the Scripture, or their Master's word; but that they did not, till now, *rightly apprehend* the meaning of either, in relation to this subject. Another instance of this application of the verb *πιστευω*, we have, ch. iii. 12.

24. *Because he knew them all*; *Δια το αυτον γινωσκειν παντας.* The Gr. expression is an apt example of ambiguous construction, for it is equally capable of being rendered *because they all knew him.* Yet interpreters, if I mistake not, have been unanimous in rendering it in the former way. This unanimity is itself a presumption in favour of that way; but when to this is added the scope of the context, it is rendered indubitable. We can easily understand how a man's knowledge of some persons should hinder him from trusting them, but not how he should be hindered by their knowledge of him. Besides, the

words in the following verse, show that it is solely of our Lord's penetration into the characters of men, that the Evangelist is speaking.

CHAPTER III.

3. *Unless a man be born again*, εαν μη τις γεννηθε ανωθεν. Hey. *Unless a man be born from above.* The word ανωθεν will, no doubt, admit either interpretation. But that the common version is here preferable, is evident from the answer given by Nicodemus, which shows, that he understood it no otherwise than as a second birth. And let it be observed, that, in the Cha. language, spoken by our Lord, there is not the same ambiguity which we find here in the Gr. The word occurs in this sense, Gal. iv. 9. The oldest versions concur in this interpretation. Vul. *Nisi quis renatus fuerit denuo.* With this, Cas. and Be. perfectly agree in sense. Er. indeed, says, *Nisi quis natus fuerit e supernis.* In this he is followed, as usual, by the translator of Zu. The Sy. is conformable to the Vul. So are also the Ger. the Itn. and all the Fr. versions, Romish, and Protestant. All the Eng. translators also, except Hey. render the words in the same manner.

2 *He cannot discern the reign of God*, ου δυναται ιδειν την βασιλειαν του Θεου. E. T. *He cannot see the kingdom of God.* The common explanation that is given of the word *see*, in this passage, is *enjoy*, *share in.* Accordingly, it is considered as synonymous with *enter*, verse 5. Though I admit, in a great measure, the truth of this exposition, I do not think it comprehends the whole of what the words imply. It is true, that *to see*, often denotes *to enjoy*, or *to suffer*, as suits the nature of the object seen. Thus, *to see death*, is used for *to die ; to see life*, for *to live ; to see good days*, for *to enjoy good days ;* and *to see corruption*, for *to suffer corruption.* But this sense of the word *seeing*, is limited to a very few phrases, of which those now mentioned are the chief. I have not however, found an example, setting this passage aside as questionable, of ιδειν βασιλειαν, for *enjoying a kingdom*, or partaking therein. Let it be observed further, that the form of the expression is not that used in threatening, which is always by the future, or by some

periphrasis of like import. Thus, as in the same chapter, verse 36. *ουκ οψεται ζωην* is denounced as a threat, the expression would probably have been here, had that been the scope, *ουκ οψεται την βασιλειαν του Θεου*. Whereas, the verb *δυναμαι*, with the negative particle, denotes, I imagine, an unfitness or incapacity in regard to the action or enjoyment mentioned. I understand, therefore, the word *ιδειν* to imply here, what it often implies, *to perceive*, *to discern*, not by the bodily organ, but by the eye of the mind. *To see*, for to conceive, to understand, is a metaphor familiar to all classes of people, and to be found in every language. The import, therefore, in my apprehension, is this: 'The man who is not regenerated, or born again of water 'and spirit, is not in a capacity of perceiving the reign of God, 'though it were commenced. Though the kingdom of the 'saints on the earth were already established, the unregenerate 'would not discern it, because it is a spiritual, not a worldly 'kingdom, and capable of being no otherwise than spiritually 'discerned. And as the kingdom itself would remain unknown 'to him, he could not share in the blessings enjoyed by the sub-'jects of it.' This last clause appears to be the import of that expression, verse 5th, *he cannot enter the kingdom of God*. The two declarations, therefore, are not synonymous, but related; and the latter is consequent upon the former. The same sentiment occurs, 1 Cor. ii. 14. So far I agree with the common exposition, that, *to see*, means here *to enjoy*; for a great part of the enjoyment of those born of the spirit, consists, doubtless, in their spiritual discernment of things divine, or results from it. Let it be observed further, that the sense here given to the words makes the connexion and pertinency of the whole discourse much clearer. It is represented as our Lord's answer to what Nicodemus had said to him. Now, though I acknowledge that the verb *αποκρινεσθαι* does not in the N. T. always imply strictly what the verb *to answer* implies with us (it being frequently used, agreeably to the Heb. idiom, of one who begins a conversation,) yet when it is preceded by the words of a different speaker, which though not a question, seem to require some notice, we shall not often err in rendering *to answer*. Such a case is the present. Nicodemus had acquainted our Lord what, in brief, his faith was concerning him, and the foundation on which it was built. His faith was, that Jesus was a teacher

whom God had specially commissioned, in other words a Prophet; and his reason for thinking so, was the miracles which he performed. This, we may rest assured, from what he says when evidently disposed to say the most he could, was the sum of his belief at that time concerning Jesus. No mention is made of the Messiah, or of his reign upon the earth. It is in reference to this defect, in the words of Nicodemus, partly, as it were, to account for his silence on this article, and partly to point out to him the proper source of this knowledge, that our Lord answers, by observing that, unless a man be enlightend by the spirit, or born anew, not to the light of this world, but to that of the heavenly, he cannot discern either the signs of the Messiah, or the nature of his government. For let it be observed, that Nicodemus, though more candid than any Jew of his rank at that time, and willing to weigh, impartially, the evidence of a divine mission, even in one who was detested by the ruling powers; was not altogether superior to those prejudices concerning the secular kingdom of the Messiah, which seem to have been universal among the Jews of that age. It is a very fine, and, at the same time, a very just observation of Cyril, that our Lord's reprehensions, in this conversation, in some respects more severe than ordinary, are to be understood as directed, not so much against Nicodemus, as against the guides and instructers of the age, the class to which Nicodemus belonged. Augustine is of opinion, that it was necessary thus to humble the spiritual pride of the Pharisee, the conceited superiority to the vulgar in things sacred, which is the greatest obstruction to divine knowledge; that he might be prepared for receiving, with all humility, the illumination of the spirit.

5. *Unless a man be born of water and spirit*, *εαν μη τις γεννηθη εξ ὑδατος και πνευματος*. Vul. *Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et spiritu sancto*. For neither of these variations in the Vul. *renatus* for *natus*, and *sancto* added to *spiritu*, do we find any authority from MSS. or (if we except the Sax.) from versions.

[2] It may be proper to observe, in passing, that though our Lord, in this account of regeneration, joins *water* and *spirit* together, he does not, in contrasting it with natural generation, verse 6th, mention *the water* at all, but opposes simply *the spirit* to *the flesh*, as the original principles, if I may so express myself, of those different sorts of birth. Again, in what he says,

verse 8th, of the manner wherein this change is effected, the regenerate are distinguished solely by the words *born of the spirit.*

8. *The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof; but knowest not whence it cometh, or whither it goeth; so it is with every one who is born of the spirit*—*Το πνευμα ὁπυ θελει πνει, και την φωνην αυτυ ακυεις, αλλ' υκ οιδας ποθεν ερχεται και πυ ὑπαγει· ὑτως εξι πας ὁ γεγεννημενος εκ τυ πνευματος.* Vul. Fr. Zu. *Spiritus, ubi vult, spirat, et vocem ejus audis, sed nescis unde veniat aut quo vadat: sic est omnis qui natus est ex spiritu.* It is worthy of remark, that as, in the Gr. and in the Vul. the same word, in this passage, signifies both *wind* and *spirit*, the illustration is expressed with more energy than it is possible to give it in those languages which do not admit the same ambiguity. The Sy. does admit it, and is an exact version of the words, in the full extent they have in the original. As, in most modern tongues, it is necessary to recur to different words for explaining the same term, in the beginning of the verse and in the end, this gives a degree of obscurity, and an appearance of incoherency, to the version, which the original has not. The Fr. translators from the Vul. as Si. Sa. and P. R. have employed the word *l'esprit* in both places. *L'esprit souffle où il veut, et vous entendez bien sa voix.* This sounds oddly in our ears. It would be still worse to render *πνευμα*, *wind*, in both places. But to preserve the similitude, and express the sense with sufficient perspicuity, in a modern language, would require more of the manner of paraphrase, than is thought sufferable in a translator. As this manner, however, is not offensive in a note, I shall give what appears to me the purport of verses 7th and 8th. 'Nor is there,' as if he had said, 'any thing in this, either absurd, or unintelligible. The 'wind, which, in Hebrew, is expressed by the same word as spir-'it, shall serve for an example. It is invisible; we hear the 'noise it makes, but cannot discover what occasions its rise or its 'fall. It is known to us solely by its effects. Just so it is with 'this second birth. The spirit himself, the great agent, is invisi-'ble, his manner of operating is beyond our discovery; but the 'reality of his operation is perceived by the effects produced on 'the disposition and life of the regenerate.'

10. *The teacher of Israel, ὁ διδασκαλος τυ Ισραηλ.* E. T. *A*

master of Israel. The article here is remarkable; the more so, because there does not appear to be a single Gr. copy which omits it. As a member of the sanhedrim, Nicodemus had a superintendency in what concerned religious instruction, and might, on that account, have been called *a teacher of Israel;* but it is probably to intimate to us a distinguished fame for abilities in this respect, that he is styled, by way of eminence, ὁ διδασκαλος. It appears so particular, that it ought not to be overlooked by the translator. Be. after Er. has properly distinguished it in La. which has not articles, by the pronoun, *magister ille Israelis.* The only other version I know, wherein attention has been paid to the article in this place, is Diodati's who says, *il dottore d' Israel.* The reproof conveyed in this verse is thought to have an allusion to certain figures of speech, pretty similar to those used on this occasion by our Lord, and not unfrequent among the rabbies, who considered the baptism of proselytes as a new birth. To this sort of language, therefore, it might be thought extraordinary that Nicodemus should be so much a stranger. I think, however, that our Lord's censure rather relates to his being so entirely unacquainted with that effusion of the spirit which would take place under the Messiah, and which had been so clearly foretold by the Prophets.

12. *If ye understood not.* Ch. ii. 22. [2] N.

13. *Whose abode is heaven,* ὁ ων εν τω ϐρανω. E. T. *Which is in heaven.* Two MSS. of no name, read εκ τϐ ϐρανϐ. But as this reading is supported by no ancient author or translator, it has no authority. The common reading is not unsuitable to the style of the writer. Ὁ ων εις τον κολπον τϐ πατρος, ch. i. 18. is a similar expression. Both are intended to denote, rather what is habitual and characteristic of the person, than what obtains at a particular instant. By the expression, ὁ ων εις τον κολπον τϐ πατρος, is meant, not only 'who is the special object of the father's love,' but 'who is admitted to his most secret counsels.' By ὁ ων εν τω ϐρανω, is meant, 'whose abode, whose residence, 'whose home is there.' This is agreeable, in import, to the interpretation given by Nonnus:

——Ὁς αξεροεντι μελαθρω
Πατριον ϐδας εχων, αιωνιος αιθερα ναιει.

14. *As Moses placed on high the serpent*, καθως Μωσης ὑψωσε τον οφιν. E. T. *As Moses lifted up the serpent.* Unless we knew the story referred to, which is related, Numb. xxi. we should not rightly understand the meaning of the expression used in the E. T. *To lift up a serpent*, implies no more than to take it off the ground, and is consequently far from expressing the import of the Gr. word ὑψωσε.

20, 21. In these two concluding verses of this conversation, our Saviour glances, as it were in passing, at the impropriety of Nicodemus' conduct in coming to consult him in the silence of the night, as one conscious of doing what he ought to be ashamed of, not as one who acted in obedience to the call of duty. To this the attention of a conscientious man would be more strongly awakened, as the preferring of darkness to light is declared to be the ground of the condemnation of infidels.

21. *That it may be manifest that his actions are agreeable to God*, ἱνα φανερωθη αυτε τα εργα, ὁτι εν Θεω εξιν ειργασμενα. E. T. *That his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God.* Vul. *Ut manifestentur opera ejus quia in Deo sunt facta.* Instead of *in Deo*, Er. says, *per Deum*, Zu. *cum Deo*, and Cas. *divinitus.* Be. has hit the sense better, rendering it *secundum Deum.* Gro. justly observes, that in such cases εν is used for κατα, and gives for an example εν Κυριῳ, 1 Cor. vii. 39. In this Be. has been followed by Dio. who says *secondo Iddio*, the G. E. *according to God*, and the G. F. *selon Dieu.* In the same manner, both L. Cl. and Beau. translate the words. I may also add, Si. who, though not chargeable with partiality to Be. and though translating from the Vul. has here adopted the method of the Genevese interpreter, and rendered it *selon Dieu.* I have expressed the same sense with as much plainness as our idiom will admit.

25. *John's disciples had a dispute with a Jew*, εγενετο ζητησις εκ των μαθητων Ἰωαννε μετα Ἰεδαιων. E. T. *There arose a question between some of John's disciples and the Jews.* There is no ellipsis here, εκ being used for απο. Though the common editions read *Ἰεδαιων*, the greater number of MSS. amongst which are some of the most valuable, some ancient expositors also and critics, read *Ἰεδαιε* in the singular. With this agree both the Sy.

versions. To this reading also Nonnus the Gr. versifier and paraphrast, who commonly keeps pretty close to the sense, has also given his sanction:

Εριϛ δε τις αμφι καθαρμϖ
Επλετο μυϛιπολοισιν Ιωανναο μαθηταις
Ἑβραιϖ μετα φωτος.

Add to these some of our best modern critics, as Gro. Cocceius, Ham. Mill, and Wet.

[2] *About purification*, *περι καθαριϛμϖ*: that is, as appears from the sequel, about baptisms and other legal ablutions.

29. *The bridegroom is he who hath the bride*, *ὁ εχων την νυμφην, νυμφιος εϛιν.* E. T. *He that hath the bride is the bridegroom.* As the manifest intention here is to point out the distinction between Jesus *the bridegroom* and John *his friend*, the arrangement I have given the words is more suited to the Eng. idiom. The other way appears to us an inversion of the natural order, and is consequently less perspicuous.

32. *Yet his testimony is not received.* This, compared with the clause, *He who receiveth his testimony*, which immediately follows, is a strong evidence that the words of Scripture ought not to be more rigidly interpreted, than the ordinary style of dialogue; wherein such hyperboles as *all* for *many*, and *none* for *few*, are quite familiar.

33. *Voucheth the veracity of God*, *εϛφραγιϛεν ὁτι ὁ Θεος αληθηϛ εϛιν.* E. T. *Hath set to his seal that God is true.* As *sealing* was employed for vouching the authenticity of writs, *to seal* came, by a natural and easy transition, to signify *to vouch*, *to attest.* Our acceptance of God's message by his Son, through an unshaken faith, vouches, on our part, the faithfulness of God, and the truth of his promises.

34. *For he whom God hath commissioned, relateth God's own words.* *Ὁν γαρ απεϛειλεν ὁ Θεος, τα ρηματα τϖ Θϖ λαλει.* There is the same kind of ambiguity here which was remarked in ch. ii. 24. The version may be, *God's own words relate whom God hath commissioned.* Here also translators appear unanimous in preferring the former version, which is likewise more agreeable to the

usual application of the terms. It is more natural to represent a person as speaking words, than words as speaking a person. It is, besides, favoured by the connection. Wa. seems to have declared himself an exception from the unanimity in both cases, but without assigning a reason. See his New Translation.

CHAPTER IV.

1. *Jesus*, ὁ Κύριος. E. T. *The Lord.* But the Cam. and ten other MSS. read ὁ Ἰησους. It is thus read also in the Vul. both the Sy. the Cop. the Arm. the Ara. and the Sax. versions. Chr. has read so, and it is also in some printed editions. As this difference in reading makes not the smallest change in the sense, but a change to the better in the composition of the sentence, I thought the above mentioned authority sufficient for adopting it. The way in which the sentence runs in the E. T. would naturally lead the reader to think that one person is meant by *the Lord*, and another by *Jesus*. *When, therefore, the Lord knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made*—— Several of the authorities aforesaid drop Ἰησους in the latter part of the verse. I am surprised that this has been overlooked by Wet.

5. *Near the heritage*, πλησιον τω χωριω. E. T. *Near to the parcel of ground.* This application of the word *parcel* is very unusual. The word χωριον means an estate in land; and as the estate here spoken of was given by the Patriarch to his son Joseph, to be possessed by him and his posterity, it is properly denominated *heritage*, agreeably to what we are told, Josh. xxi. 32. It is so rendered into Fr. by Beau. Sa. P. R. and Si.

9. *For the Jews have no friendly intercourse with the Samaritans*, ου γαρ συγχρωνται Ἰουδαιοι Σαμαρειταις. E. T. *For the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans.* That the word *dealings* implies too much to suit the sense of this passage, is manifest from the preceding verse, where we are told that the disciples were gone into the Samaritan city Sychar to buy food. The verb συγχραομαι is one of those called ἁπαξ λεγομενα: it does not occur in any other place of the N. T. or in the Sep. The Pharisees were, in their traditions, nice distinguishers. Buying and selling with Samaritans was permitted, because that was considered as an intercourse

merely of interest or conveniency; borrowing and lending, much more asking or accepting any favour, was prohibited; because that was regarded as an intercourse of friendship, which they thought impious to maintain with those whom they looked upon as the enemies of God.

10. *The bounty of God, την δωρεαν τυ Θευ.* E. T. *The gift of God.* The word *δωρεα* means not only a particular gift, but that disposition of mind from which the gift arises, *bounty, liberality, goodness.* In this sense it is sometimes used by the Apostle Paul, as Eph. iii. 7. iv. 7. Most translators, not attending to this, have rendered these verses by tautologies and indefinite expressions, to the great hurt of perspicuity. The meaning of the word is, I imagine, the same in Heb. vi. 4. But the plainest example of this acceptation we have in the Apocryphal book of Wisdom, ch. xvi. 25. where the care of Providence in supporting every living thing, is, in an address to God, called *ἡ παντοτροφος συ δωρεα*, literally, in Eng. *thy all-nourishing bounty.* This meaning appears also more pertinent and emphatical in the passage under consideration. A particular gift cannot be understood as referred to, when there is nothing in the context to suggest it. But there seems to be intended here a contrast between the munificence of God, which extends to those of all regions and denominations upon the earth, and the contracted spirit of man, who is ingenious in devising pretexts for confining the divine liberality to as few objects as possible. To this train of sentiment the preceding words naturally lead. The woman had expressed her astonishment that a Jew could ask even so small a favour as a draught of water from a Samaritan. Jesus tells her, that if she had considered more the bounty of the universal Parent, from which none are excluded by the distinction of Jew, Samaritan, or Heathen, than maxims founded in the malignity of man, and if she had known the character of him who talked with her, she might have asked successfully a gift infinitely more important.

[3] *Living water, ὑδωρ ζων.* It may surprise an English reader, unacquainted with the Oriental idiom, that this woman, who appears, by the sequel, to have totally misunderstood our Lord, did not ask what he meant by *living water*, but proceeded on the supposition that she understood him perfectly, and only did not conceive how, without some vessel for drawing and containing

that water, he could provide her with it to drink. The truth is, the expression is ambiguous. In the most familiar acceptation, *living water* meant no more than running water. In this sense the water of springs and rivers would be denominated *living*, as that of cisterns and lakes would be called *dead*, because motionless. Thus, Gen. xxvi. 19. we are told that Isaac's servants digged in the valley, and found there a well of springing water. It is *living water* both in the Heb. and in the Gr. as marked on the margin of our Bibles. Thus also, Lev. xiv. 5. what is rendered *running water* in the Eng. Bible, is in both these languages *living water*. Nay, this use was not unknown to the Latins, as may be proved from Virgil and Ovid. In this passage, however, our Lord uses the expression in the more sublime sense for divine teaching, but was mistaken by the woman as using it in the popular acceptation.

11. *Thou hast no bucket, ατε αντλημα εχεις.* E. T. *Thou hast nothing to draw with. Αντλημα*, from *αντλεω, haurio* is *haustrum, situla, vas ad hauriendum ;* which is the definition of a *bucket.* So Dod. also renders the word.

20. *This mountain*, to wit, Gerizim, at the foot of which Sychar was built, and on which the Samaritans had formerly erected a temple, though not then remaining. For they pretended that this was the place where the Patriarchs had offered sacrifice, and which God himself had set apart as the only place consecrated for the performance of the most solemn and public ceremonies of their religion. In support of this their opinion they quote some passages from the Pentateuch (the only part of Scripture which they acknowledge), particularly Deut. xxvii. 4. where, instead of Ebal, as it is in all the Jewish copies of the Heb. Scriptures commonly received, the Samaritan copies of the same scriptures read Gerizim.

22. *Ye worship what ye know not ; we worship what we know— υμεις προσκυνειτε ὁ ουκ οιδατε· ημεις προσκυνεμεν ὁ οιδαμεν.* E. T. *Ye worship ye know not what ; we know what we worship.* There is apparently no difference between these two versions, except that the first keeps closer to the arrangement of the Gr. But in effect this makes here a considerable difference. The

same thought is conveyed in both; but in the former with the simplicity of the original, wherein great plainness is used, but nothing that savours of passion; whereas it is impossible to read the latter without perceiving much of the manner of a contemptuous reproach, and what would have therefore more befitted the mouth of a Pharisee than of our Lord. So much in language depends often on a very small circumstance. *What ye know not*, contrasted to *what we know*, implies, in the Heb. idiom, not total ignorance, but inferior knowledge. Thus *love* and *hatred* are opposed (see L. xiv. 26), to denote merely greater and less love. Now, if the writings of the Prophets were of importance for conveying the knowledge of the perfections and will of God, the Samaritans, who rejected all those writings (receiving only for canonical, the five books of Moses), must, on this head, have been more ignorant than the Jews, which is all that our Saviour's words imply.

[2] *Salvation is from the Jews.*—The Saviour or the Messiah must be of that nation, of the tribe of Judah, and posterity of David.

25. *I know that the Messiah cometh; (that is, the Christ.)* *Οιδα ὁτι Μεσσιας ερχεται, ὁ λεγομενος Χριστος.* E. T. *I know that Messias cometh, which is called Christ.* In the manner wherein the last clause, *which is called Christ*, is here expressed, it appeass to have been spoken by the woman: yet, it is manifest that that could not have been the case. Our Lord and the woman spoke a dialect of the Chaldee, at that time the language of the country, and in the N. T. called Hebrew, wherein *Messiah* was the proper term, and consequently needed not to be explained to either into Greek, which they were not speaking, and which was a foreign language to both. But it was very proper for the Evangelist, who wrote in Greek, and in the midst of those who did not understand Chaldee, when introducing an Oriental term, to explain it for the sake of his Gr. readers. Ch. i. 43. N.

27. *That he talked with a woman,* *ὁτι μετα γυναικος ελαλει.* E. T. *That he talked with the woman.* The learned reader will observe, that *γυναικος* here has no article, and is consequently better rendered *a woman.* We need not be surprised that it should be matter of wonder to the disciples, that their Master was talking with *a woman;* for so great, at that time, was the pride of the learned, in that nation, that they imagined that to have a dialogue with such, on any serious and important matter,

did but ill suit the dignity and gravity which ought to be uniformly maintained by a rabbi, or doctor of their law. Admit that the passages in proof of this, produced by Lightfoot, from the Talmud and rabbinical writers, are unaccountable and stupid, as Dod. angrily calls them, they are sufficient evidence that such a sentiment, however unaccountable and stupid, prevailed among them. Now it is the fact, the prevalence of the sentiment, and not its reasonableness, with which the interpreter is concerned. Further, that the disciples were not, in any thing, superior to the prejudices of the age, is manifest from the whole of their history. That the woman was a Samaritan, doubtless, made the thing more astonishing.

29. *Is this the Messiah?* μητι ουτος εστιν ὁ Χριστος; E. T. *Is not this the Christ?* see Mt. xii. 23. N. The reason given by Knatchbull for preferring the common version, is far from being decisive. Though the woman's opinion had been (as probably it was) that our Lord was the Messiah: still it was more becoming in her to put the question simply to the men of the city, *Is this the Messiah?* than in the other way, *Is not this the Messiah?* which plainly suggested her own opinion, before she heard their's. The internal evidence, arising from the scope of the passage is therefore, to say the least, as favourable to this interpretation as to the other; and the external evidence arising from use, which in this case ought to preponderate, is entirely in its favour.

42. *The Messiah*, ὁ Χριστος. This is wanting in two or three MSS. and in the Vul. Cop. Arm. Ethiop. and Sax. versions.

44. [*But not to Nazereth*]. There is a probability that something to this purpose has been very early omitted in transcribing. The casual conjunction γαρ, which introduces the verse, shows that it contains the reason of what had immediately preceded. As, however, in regard to the clause itself, we have nothing more than conjecture from the scope of the place, and the known historical facts, I have enclosed in crotchets, the words which I thought it necessary to supply.—By his *country*, πατριδι, is commonly meant *Nazareth*, supposed to be his native city, and in fact the place of his early residence.

46. *Officer of the court*, βασιλικος. E. T. *Nobleman*. The

Sy. and Ara. render it a *servant*, or *minister of the king ;* that is, of Herod the tetrarch of Galilee, commonly in that country (whose language did not supply words corresponding to all the distinctions made by the Greeks) styled *king*. The Vul. says *regulus ;* but in the judgment of the best critics, the word then implied no more than *regius*, and denoted in general an eminent officer of the court. The Eng. word *nobleman* conveys the notion of hereditary rank and certain dignities, to which there was nothing in Palestine, or even in Syria, that corresponded. Yet all the late Eng. versions have in this implicitly followed the common translation; and it is remarkable, that not one of the foreign versions I have seen, has adopted a term answering to that Eng. word. Diss. VII. P. I. § 5. 6.

54. *This second miracle Jesus performed after returning from Judea to Galilee*, τουτο παλιν δευτερον σημειον εποιησεν ὁ Ιησους, ελθων εκ της Ιουδαιας εις την Γαλιλαιαν. E. T. *This is again the second miracle that Jesus did, when he was come out of Judea into Galilee.* The words of the historian do not necessarily imply more than that this, which was the second of our Lord's miracles in that country, was performed after returning from Judea to Galilee ; the first miracle being understood to be that of turning water into wine at the marriage in Cana. From the way in which it is expressed in the common version, we should conclude that both miracles were after the return to Galilee, which is not agreeable to the fact as related in the preceding part of this history. The word παλιν, whatever be the interpretation, must be placed differently. I arrange the words in this manner: Τουτο δευτερον σεμηειον εποιησεν ὁ Ιησους, παλιν ελθων εκ της Ιουδαιας εις την Γαλιλαιαν. It is agreeable to a rule of universal grammar, that in construing a sentence, the adverbs be joined to the verbs or the participles. There are here but two of these, εποιησεν and ελθων. To join παλιν to the former would be absurd, because it would represent the same individual miracle as twice performed. It must, by consequence, be joined to the latter.

CHAPTER V.

2. *There is*, εστι. The Sy. seems to have read η, as it is rendered in that version in the past. Cyril, Chr. and The. favour this reading, so does Nonnus. If tolerably supported, it would be accounted preferable, as this gospel was written after the destruction of Jerusalem.

[2] *Nigh the sheep-gate*, επι τη προβατικη. E. T. *By the sheep-market.* This clause is omitted in the Sy. and Sax. versions. The learned reader will observe that there is nothing in the Gr. which answers to either *gate* or *market;* but the word used, being an adjective, requires some such addition to complete the sense. Now, we have good evidence, that one of the gates of Jerusalem was called *the sheep-gate.* See Nehem. iii. 1. & 32. xii. 39. But we have no evidence that any place there was called *the sheep-market.* Be. renders the words *ad portam pecuariam;* Dio. *presso della porta delle pecore;* P. R. Beau. L. Cl. *près de la porte des brebis;* in Eng. the An. Hey. and Wes. *by the sheep-gate.* The Vul. seems to have read differently. The preposition επι is omitted, and the words προβατικη κολυμβηθρα are read as adjective and substantive, in the nominative case, *est autem probatica piscina quæ cognominatur Hebraice Bethsaida.* With this Cas. partly agrees and partly differs. He reads the preposition as in the Gr. and προβατικη κολυμβηθρα, as agreeing in the dative, *est autem Hierosolymis apud oviaricam piscinam ea quæ Hebraice Bethesda nuncupatur.* The reading in the Vul. is quite unsupported, and therefore not worthy of regard. Cas. assigns two reasons for his interpretation. One is, that προβατικη would be without a substantive. Now it is a known idiom in Gr. to employ an adjective alone, when the substantive to be supplied is easily suggested by the import of the adjective, or by frequent use. Thus the names of most arts and sciences in Gr. are the feminines of adjectives, whose meaning easily suggests the word understood. Μουσικη, for instance, ιατρικη, μαθηματικη, τεχνη being understood to each of the two former, and επιστημη to the last. The frequent conjunction of a particular substantive with a particular adjective, produces the same effect.

Now, if one of the gates of Jerusalem was ever called ἡ προβατικη πυλη, as we know from the O. T. that it was, nothing could be more natural in those who spoke Gr. than to drop πυλη as superfluous, and name it simply ἡ προβατικη. This would happen still more readily, if the adjective was in a manner appropriated to that single use. Now it is remarkable, that the adjective προβατικος occurs nowhere in the N. T. but in this passage; and never in the Old, but where mention is made of *the sheep-gate* of Jerusalem. Ἡμερα κυριακη occurs once in the N. T. and is properly rendered *the Lord's day* (Rev. i. 10). The frequent appropriation of this distinction to the first day of the week, and the custom arising thence, of conceiving ἡμερα as closely connected with κυριακη, brought people gradually to drop ἡμερα as unnecessary, being what the hearer's knowledge and habits would readily supply. In this manner κυριακη alone in Gr. and *dominica* in Lat. came to signify *the Lord's day*. Βασιλικος, in the former chapter, which signifies *an officer of the court*, is properly an adjective in the masculine, answering to *regius* in Lat. and *royal* in Eng. To make the expression complete, we must supply ανθρωπος. In like manner βασιλειον (L. VII. 25), the neuter gender of βασιλειος, an adjective of the same signification, has come to denote *a royal palace*. The word οικητηριον, or some other neuter of the same import has been joined with it at first, but afterwards overlooked as useless. Take the following examples for a specimen from the Gospels, Mt. vi. 3, ἡ αριστερα, scilicet χειρ, *the left hand*, x. 42. ποτηριον ψυχρου, scilicet ὑδατος, *a cup of cold water*. L. i. 39. εις την ορεινην, scilicet χωραν, into *the hill country*. J. xx. 12. εν λευκοις, scilicet ἱματιοις, *in white garments*. Castalio's other objection against the common rendering is, that it appropriates the name *Bethesda*, which signifies *the house of mercy*, improperly to *a pool* or bath, which cannot, in any sense, be denominated *a house*. I answer, first, that though *Beth*, the first part of the name *Bethesda*, denotes commonly *a house;* yet when such terms are compounded with others in forming a proper name, they ought not to be so strictly interpreted. The place to which Jacob first gave the name *Bethel*, that is, *the house of God*, Gen. xxviii. 10, &c. was evidently at the time a place in the open fields, where he had slept all night, with a stone for his pillow, and had the dream of the ladder. That there was then in the vicinity, or afterwards perhaps upon the spot, a city which was first called *Luz*, and

probably after the division of the country by Joshua, *Bethel*, in memory of what had there happened to the patriarch, is readily admitted. When *Beth* made part of the name of a city, there was a plain deviation from the primitive meaning of the word. Yet nothing was more common. *Bethlehem*, the city of David, denotes *the house of bread.* What was called by the Greeks *Heliopolis*, the city of the sun, was in Heb. *Bethshemesh*, the house of the sun. I answer, 2dly, That we ought not to confine the signification of κολυμβηθρα to the water collected, but ought to consider it as including the covered walks, and all that had been built for the accommodation of those who came thither. In this extent the word *bath* is familiarly used by ourselves. I have preferred the name *bath* to *pool*, as more suitable to the purpose to which this water was appropriated.

4. Several MSS. to αγγελος add κυριου. Vul. *Angelus Domini*, followed by the Arm. and Sax. versions.

16. *And sought to kill him*, και εζητουν αυτον αποκτειναι. This clause is not in the Cam. and some other MSS. of note. It is wanting also in the Vul. Cop. Arm. and Sax. versions.

18. *By calling God peculiarly his Father, had equalled himself with God*, πατερα ιδιον ελεγε τον Θεον, ισον εαυτον ποιων τω Θεω. Vul. *Patrem suum dicebat Deum, æqualem se faciens Deo.* E. T. *Said also that God was his Father, making himself equal with God.* On a little reflection it must be evident that the sense is, in both these versions, imperfectly expressed. For how could those men say that Jesus, by calling God his father, made himself equal with God? There must, therefore, be here something peculiar and energetic in the word ιδιος. The expression in most familiar use would have been πατερα εαυτου. And, though I am far from saying that there are not many cases in which either expression may be used indifferently, there are some in which ιδιος is more emphatical, and others in which it would not be strictly proper. Be.'s explanation of the word is very just; *suum*, ιδιον, *id est sibi proprium ac peculiarem.* In this view the import of the words is, that God is father to him in a sense wherein he is father to no other. Let it be observed, however, that if the scope of the context did not necessarily lead to this conclusion, I should not infer so much from the mere applica-

tion of the word ἰδιος: for though this is strictly the import of the term, it is often, like many other words, employed with greater latitude. Perhaps on a superficial view, I shall be thought in this to concur with a writer who, in support of a favourite hypothesis, has thus explained the precept (1 Cor. vii. 2), ἑκαστη τον ιδιον ανδρα εχετω, "Let every married woman have "the man appropriated to her exclusively of all other men upon "earth." If, instead of men, he had said women, he would have hit the sense entirely, and suited the explanation here given of the word. As it stands, there is an indistinctness in the expression, which serves only to darken it. The exclusion of other *men* in this explanation, must satisfy every one that the words *the man appropriated to her*, are used, by what figure I know not, for *the man to whom she is appropriated;* for he is not at all *appropriated to her*, if he may have other wives; but she is manifestly *appropriated to him*, if she cannot have another husband. This strange confusion in the use of words, is frequent with that writer. Thus, a little after, "The word ἰδιος," he says, "seems to denote such an appropriation of the husband to the wife; (who would not expect it to follow, *as that he could not have, or go to any other woman?* but hear himself,) "as that she "could not have, or go to any other man." Now this shows merely the appropriation of the wife to the husband, but by no means the appropriation of the husband to the wife. *Ἰδιος* is, by this account, made synonymous with μονος, so that ἰδιος ανηρ means her only husband. By the same rule, in the parable of the compassionate Samaritan, who is said (L. x. 34.) to have set the wounded Jew επι το ιδιον κτηνος, we ought to render these words, not *on his own beast*, but *on his only beast:* or, to define it in this critic's own terms, the beast appropriated to him exclusively of all other beasts upon earth. And to give one other instance where we have in the E. T. (L. vi. 41), *but perceivest not the beam that is in thine own eye*, the words εν τῳ ιδιῳ οφθαλμῳ ought to be rendered *in thine only eye.* Let it be observed that the term ἰδιος is always conceived as denoting the person or thing appropriated, not the proprietary. In this view ἰδιος is opposed to κοινος; so that in strictness I have no title to call any thing ἰδιον which I enjoy in common with others; that this is agreeable to scriptural usage, we learn from Acts iv. 32. ουδε εἱς τι των ὑπαρχοντων ελεγεν ιδιον ειναι· αλλ' ην αυτοις ἁπαντα κοινα. *Neither said any of them, that ought of the things which he*

possessed was his own; but they had all things common. If so, no woman can call any man ιδιος ανηρ, her own, whom she has for a husband in common with other women: for such a man, in regard to his wives, is αυταις πασαις κοινος, and consequently μηδεμιας αυτων ιδιος. To apply this to the controverted passage: the sense may be justly expressed by the periphrasis quoted from Beza, *unaquæque habeat virum sibi proprium ac peculiarem;* in English, *Let every woman have the husband appropriated and peculiar to herself.* If the case had been reversed, and the apostle had said εκαστος την ιδιαν γυναικα εχετω και εκαστη τον εαυτης ανδρα, it might have been pleaded with some plausibility, that the woman was represented as the man's property, who has an exclusive right to her, whereas the man was mentioned merely as her husband. For my part, I acknowledge that, in such general precepts, the two phrases are commonly equivalent, that the marriage bond is reciprocal, and that if there has been here an intentional difference in applying those expressions, the Apostle must have judged it necessary from the circumstances of the times, to signify, in a more explicit manner, the appropriation of the husband to the wife, than that of the wife to the husband. From the corrupt customs that then prevailed among both Jews and Pagans, there must have been greater need to inculcate on Christian husbands than on Christian wives, that the marriage bond confined each of them to one, and that if the men challenged a property in their wives, it could be in no other sense admitted than in that wherein the women were entitled to challenge a property in their husbands. That author, therefore, has been exceedingly unlucky in urging the emphatical import of ιδιος in the precept above mentioned: for it is manifest that the emphasis, if allowed, must subvert his whole theory. His only resource, therefore, is that of those who, though they have overlooked this blunder in his reasoning, have so learnedly criticised his work, and who affirm, with truth, that such expressions are often used indiscriminately. In this way he may obtain a neutrality from a quarter otherwise hostile. That author thinks it remarkable, and, I own, I think so too, that it is always in the N. T. ιδιος ανηρ, and never ιδια γυνη; nor can I give any account of a use so much in favour of the weaker sex, but what has been already suggested. There was no danger that any woman should think herself entitled to a plurality of husbands, a thing repugnant to the laws and customs of all nations; but there was great danger

that there might be men who would claim a plurality of wives. This is the more worthy of notice in the writers of the N. T. as no such expression occurs so much as once in the version of the O. T. by the Seventy. It is there invariably *ανηρ αυτης* or *ἑαυτης*, never *ιδιος ανηρ*: for during that dispensation, it must be owned, things stood on a different footing. Nor could the obligations which married persons were, by positive law, brought under, be said to have been perfectly reciprocal; for the wife could not then claim the same exclusive property in her husband, as at present. But, to return from what may be thought a digression: though of consequence for ascertaining the import of the term, I have not rendered *πατερα ιδιον*, with most modorns, *his own father*, because the word *own* adds nothing to the import of the possessive *his;* it serves only to fix the attention on this circumstance. The adverb *peculiarly* seems much better adapted here to supply the defect.

20. *Which will astonish you, ινα ὑμεις θαυμαζητε.* Mt. i. 22. [2] N.

22. *Having committed the power of judging entirely to the Son, αλλα την κρισιν πασαν δεδωκε τῳ ὑιῳ.* E. T. *But hath committed all judgment unto the Son.* There are two Greek words, *κρισις* and *κριμα*, which are commonly rendered *judgment.* They are not synonymous, though sometimes used indiscriminately. *Κρισις* expresses more properly the power and even act of judging, *judicatio; κριμα* the effect *judicium*, the sentence pronounced, or even the punishment inflicted. Our Eng. word *judgment* is too indefinite to convey distinctly our Lord's meaning in this place. It is the version rather of *κριμα* than of *κρισις.* The Fr. translators, L. Cl. Beau. P. R. Sa. Si. render *πασαν κρισιν, tout pouvoir de juger.*

27. *Because he is a son of man, ὁτι ὑιος ανθρωπου εστιν.* E. T. *Because he is the son of man.* It is observed by Markland, (Bowyer's Conjectures), that it is not here *ὁ ὑιος του ανθρωπου*, the humble appellation by which our Lord commonly distinguished himself, but simply *ὑιος ανθρωπου*, without any article, a common Hebraism, and still more common Syriasm, for a *man*, a human being. This phrase occurs in the same sense, Dan. vii. 13. and Rev. i. 13. and ought to be so rendered; but it occurs nowhere in the Gospels, except in this passage. None of the Eng. translations I have seen mark this distinction; but it has been attended to by some foreign translators. Dio *Inquanto egli è figliuol d'huomo.*

G. F. *Entant qu'il est fils de l'homme.* L. Cl. P. R. and Sa. say also *fils de l'homme*, without the article. Diss. V. P. IV. § 13. It will, perhaps, be asked, But what is the meaning of the clause here, *because he is a son of man?* In my judgment, the import may be expressed in this manner—'because it suits the ends of 'divine wisdom, that the Judge, as well as Saviour, of men, 'should himself be man.'

27, 28. *And hath given him even the judicial authority, because he is a son of man. Wonder not at this,* και εξουσιαν εδωκεν αυτω και κρισιν ποιειν, ὁτι υἱος ανθρωπου εστι; Μη θαυμαζετε τουτο. Four inconsiderable MSS. make a small difference in the pointing which alters the sense. They make a full stop at ποιειν, and removing the point at εστι, join the words ὁτι υἱος ανθρωπου εστι to μη θαυμαζετε τουτο. v. 28. Differences merely in pointing are comparatively modern, as all the oldest and best have no points. Both the Sy. versions adopt this manner, and seem also to have read δε after ὁτι. But these can give no support to a reading, which, in itself, is less natural than the common one.

31. *My testimony is not to be regarded,* η μαρτυρια μου ουκ εστιν αληθης. E. T. *My witness is not true.* In every country where there are standing laws, and a regular constitution, there is what is called a forensic or juridical use of certain words, which differs considerably from familiar use. I observed something of this kind in regard to δικαιος (Mt. xxvii. 24. N.), which, in the style of the law, means *not guilty of the crime charged.* The like holds of the word αληθης, which, when used in reference to the procedure in judicatories, denotes, not what is in itself true, but what is *proved*, or is supported by legal proof. Thus, it is said, that a man's testimony of himself is not true. A man may certainly give a true testimony of himself; but in law it is not *evidence*, and is therefore held as *untrue.* This sense of the word αληθης often occurs in this Gospel. Now, as such peculiarities, in any tongue, have an awkward appearance when translated into another, I have thought it more eligible to convey the sense with as little circumlocution as possible. Hey. and Wes. say *valid:* but this term does not give the exact meaning.

35. *He was the lighted and shining lamp,* εκεινος ην ὁ λυχνος ὁ καιομενος και φαινων. E. T. *He was a burning and a shining*

light. Not only our translators, but the much greater number of modern translators, have entirely overlooked the article in this place. Yet the structure of the sentence, and the repetition of the article before the participle καιομενος, serve to draw our attention to it. It ought to be remembered, that John's ministry was of a peculiar character: that he was the single Prophet in whom the old dispensation had its completion, and by whom the new was introduced; that, therefore, until our Lord's ministry took place, John may justly be said to have been *the light* of that generation. Perhaps there is an allusion here to the expression in the Psalms, cxxxii. (or, as it is in the Gr. cxxxi.) 17. ἡτοιμασα τῳ χριστῳ μυ λυχνον, and consequently an insinuation that this was *the lamp* which God had provided according to his promise. The only modern interpreters I know, who have added the article here, are Dio. in Itn. and Si. in Fr.

[2] *Lighted*, καιομενον. E. T. *Burning.* The verb καιειν signifies *to light*, *to kindle*, *to burn.* When it is construed with λυχνος, λαμπας, or any other such term, it is properly *to light*, and is, or may be, always so rendered. See Mt. v. 15. L. xii. 35. But some are of opinion, that the word *burning*, as coupled here with *shining*, is much more expressive; inasmuch as it superadds to knowledge an ardour, zeal, or good affection in the service of God; and are convinced, that the one epithet alludes to the attractive influence of John's example, and the other to the perspicuity of his instructions. To this most paraphrasts, as Clarke and Dod. seem to have attended. But I am not satisfied that, in the original, there is any allusion of this kind. A lamp is used, not for warming people, but for giving them light. To me, in the word καιομένον, there appears rather a suggestion of the divine illumination of the Baptist. The light which was kept always burning in the sanctuary, and which came originally from heaven, was, in the judgment of the rabbies, an emblem of the light of prophecy. To many of our Lord's hearers, therefore, the word καιομενον would not appear an insignificant epithet, but an apposite suggestion of the source whence John derived his doctrine.

37, 38. *Did ye never hear his voice, or see his form? Or have ye forgotten his declaration, that ye believe not him whom he hath commissioned?* ουτε φωνην αυτυ ακηκοατε πωποτε, ουτε ειδος αυτυ ἑωρακατε. *Και τον λογον αυτυ ουκ εχετε μενοντα εν ὑμιν· ὁτι ὁν απεστειλεν εκεινος, τουτῳ ὑμεις ου πιστευετε.* E. T. *Ye have neither*

heard his voice at any time, nor seen his shape. And ye have not his word abiding in you: for whom he hath sent, him ye believe not. The reader will observe, that the two clauses which are rendered in the E. T. as declarations, are in this version translated as questions. The difference in the original is only in the pointing. That they ought to be so read, we need not, in my opinion, stronger evidence, than that they throw much light upon the whole passage, which, read in the common way, is both dark and ill connected. See an excellent note on this passage from Mr. Turner of Wakefield (Priestley's Harmony, sect. xl.) Our Lord here refers them to the testimony given of him at his baptism, when the Holy Spirit descended on him in a visible form, and when God, with an audible voice, declared him to be his beloved son and our law-giver, whom we ought to hear and obey. What has chiefly contributed to mislead interpreters, in regard to the import of this sentence, is the resemblance which it bears to what is said, ch. i. 18. *Θεον ουδεις εωρακε πωποτε, no one ever saw God;* and, ch. vi. 46. *ουχ' ὁτι τον πατερα τις εωρακε, not that any one hath seen the Father.* There is, however, a difference in the expressions; for it is not said here, *ουτε τον πατερα*, but *ουτε ειδος αυτου εωρακατε.* This, it may be thought, as it seems to ascribe a body to God, must be understood in the same way; for we are told, Deut. iv. 12. that, when the Lord spake to the people out of the fire, they saw no *similitude.* Of this they are again reminded, verse 15. But the word in the Sep. is, in both places, not *ειδος* but *ὁμοιωμα*, which, in scriptural use, appears to denote a figure so distinct and permanent, as that it may be represented in stone, wood, or metal. Now, though this is not to be attributed to God, the sacred writers do not scruple to call the visible symbol which God, on any occasion, employs for impressing men more strongly with a sense of his presence, *ειδος αυτου*, which (for want of a better term) I have rendered *his form.* Thus the Evangelist L. says, ch. iii. 22. in relating that signal transaction which is here alluded to, that the Holy Spirit descended upon Jesus, *σωματικῳ ειδει, in a bodily form.* Thus, also the word *ειδος* is applied to the appearances which God made to men, under the Mosaic dispensation. His appearance in fire upon Mount Sinai, is called by the Seventy, Ex. xxiv. 17. *το ειδος της δοξης Κυριου;* in our Bible, *the sight of the glory of the Lord;* more properly, *the glorious form* or *appearance of the Lord.* In

like manner, the word *ειδος* is applied to the symbol of the divine presence, which the Israelites enjoyed in the wilderness, the *cloud* which covered the tabernacle in the day-time, and appeared as *fire* in the night, Num. ix. 15, 16. And, to mention but one other instance, the display which he made to Moses, when he conversed with him face to face, is, in the E. T. said to be *apparently*, Num. xii. 8; but in the Sept. *εν ειδει*, that is, *in a form* or *visible figure*. Thus, in the language of Scripture, there is a manifest difference between *seeing God*, which no man ever did, he being in himself a pure spirit, and seeing *his form*, *το ειδος αυτου*, the appearance which, at any time, in condescension to the weakness of his creatures, he pleases to assume. Another evidence, if necessary, might be brought to shew that there was no intention here to express the invisibility of the divine nature; and is as follows: the clause which appears to have been so much misunderstood, is coupled with this other, *ουτε φωνην αυτου ακηκοατε ποτοτε*. Can we imagine that the impossible would have been thus conjoined with what is commonly mentioned as a privilege often enjoyed by God's people, and to which their attention is required as a duty? For though we are expressly told, that *no man ever saw God*, it is nowhere said that no man ever heard his voice. Nay, in the very place above quoted, Deut. iv. 12. where we are informed that the people saw no *similitude*, *ὁμοιωμα*, it is particularly mentioned that they heard *the voice*. To conclude: there is the greater probability in the explanation which I have given of the words, as all the chief circumstances attending that memorable testimony at his baptism are exactly pointed out,—the miraculous voice from heaven, the descent of the Holy Spirit in a bodily form, and the declaration itself then given. Dr. Clarke seems to have had some apprehension of this meaning: for, though, in his paraphrase, he explains the words in the usual way, he, in a parenthesis, takes notice of the two striking circumstances, the voice and the form at our Lord's baptism. That what is called *his word*, or declaration, verse 38th, refers to the same thing, is evident: for, otherwise, it would coincide with the testimony of Scripture, which is not introduced till verse 39th.

39. *Ye search the Scriptures*, *ερευνατε τας γραφας*. E. T. *Search the Scriptures*. The words of the Evangelist may be interpreted either way, or even as an interrogation.—*Do ye search?*

The translator's only rule, in such cases, is the connection. To me it is evident, that nothing suits this so well as the indicative. All agree, that ὃ θελετε ελθειν, which is coupled to the former verb by the conjunction και, is an indicative. Yet this is hardly consistent with propriety, if ερευνατε be not. Besides, the whole reasoning is rendered weaker by the vulgar interpretation. It is entirely suitable to say, *Ye search, because ye think thereby to obtain*—Ye act thus, in conformity to a fixed opinion. But if the words be understood as a command, it is not a cogent argument. Search, because ye think, for men may be mistaken in their thoughts; but search, because ye can thereby obtain. In Sy. and La. the words have the same ambiguity as in Gr. In Fr. L. Cl. Beau. and P. R. render it, as here, by the indicative; and in Eng. the An. Dod. Hey. and Wor. It has been said, that the second person plural of the present of the indicative, beginning a sentence, and not preceded by the pronoun, is to be understood as a question. If it be not a question, the verb must be read imperatively. In contradiction to this, many clear examples from Scripture, have been produced by former expositors.

CHAPTER VI.

11. *To those who had lain down,* τοις μαθηταις· οἱ δε μαθηται τοις ανακειμενοις. E. T. *To the disciples, and the disciples to them that were set down.* The words τοις μαθηταις· οἱ δε μαθηται, are wanting in a few MSS. of which the Al. is one. There is nothing answering to them in any of the following versions: the Vul. the two Sy. Go. Sax. Cop. Arm. Eth. and Ara.. Nonnus omits them; so does Origen. I confess, that the principal reason for rejecting this clause, is the almost unanimous testimony of ancient versions against it. Several interpolations of little consequence have arisen from the indiscreet zeal of transcribers, in supplying what they thought deficient in one Gospel out of another. Of this, the present clause, taken from Mt. xiv. 19. appears to be an example.

22. In this and the two following verses, is contained a sentence more involved than any other in this Gospel. Indeed, it is so unlike the composition of this Evangelist, as to give ground

to suspect that it has been injured in transcribing. This writer often, indeed, uses tautologies; but, except in this passage, they occasion no darkness or perplexity. The clause, *εκεινο εις ὁ ενεβησαν οἱ μαθηται αυτου*—E. T. *that wherein his disciples were entered*—is not in the Al. nor in some other MSS. There is no corresponding clause in the Vul. Go. Sax. Cop. Eth. and Ara. versions; nor in Nonnus. Ben. and Mill reject it. The Sy. has read the clause, but avoided the tautology, by omitting the following clause in this verse, to the same purpose—*αλλα μονοι οἱ μαθηται αυτου απηλθον*. I have adopted the reading of the Vul. as preferable upon the whole.

27. *For to him the Father, that is, God, hath given his attestation, τουτον γαρ ὁ πατηρ εσφραγισεν, ὁ Θεος.* E. T. *For him hath God the Father sealed.* By the manner in which *ὁ Θεος, God,* is introduced in the end of the sentence, it is manifestly done in explanation of *ὁ πατηρ*; accordingly, the sentence is complete before that word is added. It was the more pertinent here to add it, as our Lord, in the preceding part of the sentence, is called *the Son of Man.* It might, therefore, be supposed, that, by the Father, who vouched him, is meant some human being. The addition, *ὁ Θεος, that is, God,* entirely precludes this mistake. *The Father* was a title from the earliest ages given to the Deity, to distinguish him as the universal parent, or author of all things.

31. *He gave them bread of heaven to eat, αρτον εκ του ουρανου εδωκεν αυτοις φαγειν.* E. T. *He gave them bread from heaven to eat.* The words are capable of being translated either way. But *bread of heaven* appears to me an expression of greater energy than *bread from heaven.* Besides, it is more suitable to the passage in the Psalms referred to, where it is called *corn of heaven,* and *angel's food.*

32. *Moses did not give you the bread of heaven, ου Μωσης δεδωκεν υμιν τον αρτον εκ του ουρανου.* E. T. *Moses gave you not that bread from heaven.* Here, though the difference in expression is but small, the difference in meaning is considerable. The latter seems to point only to the place whence the manna came. The pronoun *that,* which is quite unwarranted, conduces much to this appearance. The former points to the true nature of that extraordinary food. Our Lord's declaration, as I imagine, imports, that it is in a subordinate sense only that what dropped from the

clouds, and was sent for the nourishment of the body, still mortal, could be called the bread of heaven, being but a type of that which hath descended from the heaven of heavens, for nourishing the immortal soul unto eternal life, and which is, therefore, in the most sublime sense, *the bread of heaven.*

33. *That which descendeth from heaven*, ὁ καταβαινων εκ του ουρανου. E. T. *He who cometh down from heaven.* Let it be observed, that ὁ αρτος, to which this participle refers, is of the masculine gender, and by consequence, susceptible of the interpretation I have given it. Let it be further observed, that this whole discourse is figurative, and that it appears, from what follows, that our Lord meant not at once to lay aside the veil wherein he had wrapped the sentiments. The request made to him in the very next verse, *give us always this bread*, shows, that he was not yet understood as speaking of a person, which he must have been, if his expression had been as explicit as that of the E. T. It is only in verse 35, that he tells them plainly, that he is himself the bread of which he had been speaking. In this exposition, I agree entirely with Dod. Hey. Wy. and Wor. and some of our best commentators.

39. *This is the will of him who sent me*, τουτο εστι το θελημα του πεμψαντος με πατρος. But the word πατρος is wanting in the Al. and several other MSS. It is not found in the Cop. and Ara. versions. The whole verse is wanting in the Go. Several of the fathers also appear not to have read the word πατρος in this place; it is wanting also in many La. MSS. As this verse is explanatory of the preceding, whereof a part is repeated, it suits the ordinary method of composition not to mention πατρος in this place, as it does not occur in the words referred to. Mill, and some other critics, agree in rejecting it.

41. *I am the bread which descended from heaven*, εγω ειμι ὁ αρτος ὁ καταβας εκ του ουρανου. Vul. *Ego sum panis vivus qui de cœlo descendi.* The addition of *vivus*, in this place, has no support from MSS. or versions; no, not even the Sax. version.

45. *Every one who hath heard and learnt from the Father, cometh unto me*, πας ουν ὁ ακουσας παρα του πατρος και μαθων ερχεται προς με. E. T. *Every man, therefore, that hath heard and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me.* Markland justly observes,

that, as the preceding words are, *they shall be all taught of God*, it would have been more consequential to subjoin, *every man, therefore, that cometh unto me, hath heard and learnt of the Father:* and there is no doubt that it is only in this way that the affirmation can be deduced, as a consequence, from what preceded. But, in some MSS. of note, the illative particle *ουν* is not found; nor is there any thing corresponding to it in the Vul. Cop. Go. and Sax. versions. Origen also omits it. Now, the omission of this particle corrects entirely the incoherency. In a case of this kind, where the connection is plainly injured by the particle, the reason above mentioned is ground sufficient for excluding it; for it is plain, that transcribers have used more freedom with connexive particles, than with the other parts of speech. And we may add, that those of this class, in supplying such helps, commonly do not consult the understanding so much as the ear.

51. *Is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world,* η σαρξ μου εστιν ην εγω δωσω υπερ της του κοσμου ζωης. Vul. *Caro mea est pro mundi vita.* The clause ην εγω δωσω is wanting in three noted MSS. and in the Eth. and Sax. versions, as well as in the Vul.

53. *Ye have not life in you,* ουκ εχετε ζωην εν εαυτοις. E. T. *Ye have no life in you.* The version I have given, is closer, both to the letter and to the sense. *The life* spoken of, is called, both before and after, ζωη αιωνιος. The adjective, though sometimes dropped, is always understood, whilst the subject of discourse continues to be the same. The import of our Lord's words is, therefore, not that there was no living principle of any sort in those who rejected him (though the expression, in the common translation, seems to imply as much), but that they had nothing of the life, about which he had been discoursing to them.

55. *For my flesh is truly meat, and my blood is truly drink,* Η γαρ σαρξ μου αληθως εστι βρωσις, και το αιμα μου αληθως εστι ποσις. A few MSS. read αληθης in both places. With them agree the Cop. and second Sy. versions. The literal translation of this reading is, *for my flesh is the true meat, and my blood is the true drink.* The difference in meaning is not material, and if it were, there is not sufficient authority, in this place for an alteration.

56. The Cam. MS. and one of Stephens's, after *αυτῳ*, add, *καθος εν εμοι ὁ πατηρ, κἀγω εν τῳ πατρι. Αμην αμην λεγω ὑμιν· εαν μη λαβητε το σωμα του υἱου του ανθρωπου, ὡς τον αρτον της ζωης, ουκ εχετε ζωην εν αυτῳ. As the Father is in me, and I am in the Father. Verily, verily, I say unto you, unless ye receive the body of the son of man as the bread of life, ye have not life in him.* That Dr. Mill should on so slight authority, even by his own account (Proleg. 1268, &c.), favour an addition which, as Whitby observes (Exam. Millii), has the sanction of no ecclesiastical writer, no translation, no commentary, and is, besides, unsuitable to the style of the context, is truly amazing.

57. *As the Father liveth who sent me, and I live by the Father; even so, he who feedeth on me, shall live by me—καθως απεστειλε με ὁ ζων πατηρ, κἀγω ζω δια τον πατερα· και ὁ τρωγων με, κἀκεινος ζησεται δι' εμε.* E. T. *As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me.* In the Oriental tongues, the present participle supplies the present of the indicative. We have an example of it in the above passage: but the illustration conveyed in that manner is more clearly expressed in modern tongues, when rendered by the indicative. I have, therefore, taken this method here, which is approved by Gro. and followed by Cas. who says, *quemadmodum vivit pater qui me misit.* Maldonat also explains it in the same manner. The clauses, *καθως απεστειλε με ὁ ζων πατηρ, κἀγω ζω δια τον πατερα*, make not a complete comparison, but only, what I may call, one moiety of a comparison, whereof what follows, *και ὁ τρωγων με, κἀκεινος ζησεται δι' εμε*, makes the other. A comparison of the same taste we have, ch. x. 14, 15. It must be owned, that *δια*, with the accusative, commonly marks the final, not the efficient, cause, answering to the La. *propter*, not to *per*. But it is confessed on all sides, that this does not always hold. The Vul. indeed, Er. and Zu. render it *propter*; Cas. and Be. *per*. But even the expounders of the Vul. and translators from it, consider the preposition *propter* here, as equivalent to *per*. P. R. and Sa. render it in Fr. *par* not *pour*. Maldonat and Si. admit that *propter* means here the same as *per*. The whole scope of the context is so manifestly favourable to this interpretation, and adverse to the other, as to leave no reasonable doubt.

69. *The son of the living God*, ὁ υἱος του Θεου του ζωντος. Vul. *Filius Dei.* Του ζωντος is wanting in a few MSS. The same defect is found in the Cop. Arm. and Sax. versions, as in the Vul. Nonnus also omits this epithet.

70. *A spy.* Diss. VI. P. I. § 4, 5, 6.

CHAPTER VII.

8. *I go not yet*, εγω ουπω αναβαινω. Vul. *Ego autem non ascendo.* The Cam. and another MS. read ουκ for ουπω. The Cop. Sax. and Eth. versions read as the Vul.

12. *Much whispering*, γογγυσμος πολυς. E. T *Much murmuring.* The word *murmuring* would in this place, convey the notion of discontent, grumbling. This does not appear to be suggested by the original term. It expresses solely the secrecy and caution which the people found it convenient to use in speaking on this subject, being prompted, not by their resentments, but by their fears. Γογγυσμος, in this, stands in opposition to παρρησια in the next verse.

15. *Whence cometh this man's learning?* πως ουτος γραμματα οιδε; An. *How came he acquainted with the Scriptures?* Some foreign translators also render the words in the same manner. It was no doubt our Lord's acquaintance with the Scriptures, and reasoning from them, which occasioned the remark. But there appears no reason for confining the word γραμματα to this signification. Indeed, the expression, τα ἱερα γραμματα, occurs, 2 Tim. iii. 15. in this sense; but this is rather an argument against rendering it so here, where γραμματα has neither the epithet nor the article with which it is accompanied in that place. The article for the sake of emphasis, invariably attends γραφη (which without it, means no more than *a writing*), when it denotes *the Scriptures.* We cannot, then, think, that so vague a term as γραμματα, without any mark of distinction, would be used for the same purpose. Further, γραμματα, for denoting *letters*, or *learning* in general, occurs elsewhere, both in the N. T. and in the ancient version of the Old. See Acts xxvi. 24. Is. xxix. 11, 12; where it may be observed, that επισταμαι γραμματα is used in a way entirely similar to the γραμματα οιδε of the passage under examination. Add to this, that, if our Lord had understood by γραμματα, *the Scriptures*, he would not surely, verse

16th, have distinguished the doctrine learnt from them, from the doctrine taught by the Father.

17. *Whosoever is minded to do his will*, εαν τις θελῃ το θελημα αυτου ποιειν. E. T. *If any man will do his will.* As the Auxiliary *will* is often no more than a sign of the future, it expresses but weakly the import of the verb θελῃ. To say, with An. and Hey. *is inclined*, or, with Wor. *if any man desire*, is still worse; because these expressions always denote a disposition of mind which comes short of a purpose or resolution, and from which we can hardly promise any thing. Dod. says, *determined*, which is very good. I prefer, with Pearce, the word *minded.* Mt. xvi. 24. N. L. xiii. 31. N.

18. *Is a stranger to deceit*, αδικια εν αυτῳ ουκ εστιν. In the use of the Seventy, αδικειν often denotes, *to lie*, *to prevaricate*, *to deceive*, and αδικια, *falsehood*, *deceit*, which is evidently the most apposite meaning in this place, where it is contrasted to αληθης. In this way, Beau. and some other late interpreters, have rendered the word.

21, 22. *I have performed one action which surpriseth you all. Moses instituted circumcision amongst you*, ἑν εργον εποιησα και παντες θαυμαζετε. Δια τουτο Μωσης δεδωκεν ὑμιν την περιτομην. E. T. *I have done one work, and ye all marvel. Moses, therefore, gave unto you circumcision.* I have, with The. who is followed by some of our best critics, joined δια τουτο to the end of verse 21. Nothing can be more incongruously connected than the words are in the Eng. and most other modern translations; where our Lord's performing a miracle is represented as the cause why Moses gave them circumcision. It is justly observed by Be. (though he has followed a different method in translating) that if δια τουτο be construed with θαυμαζετε, which makes an alteration only on the pointing, we have an example of the same construction and arrangement with the same verb. Mr. vi. 6. εθαυμαζε δια την απιστιαν αυτων; *he wondered at their unbelief.* Different methods have been adopted by translators, which in my judgment, are forced and unnatural. The method here followed is that taken by Dod. Wes. Wy. and Wor.

22. *Circumcise on the Sabbath.* The precept of circumcision required that every male child should be circumcised the eighth

day from his birth. Gen. xvii. 10, &c. Lev. xii. 3. Though the eighth day happened to be the Sabbath, this ceremony was not deferred; and the law of circumcision vacated the law of the Sabbath.

23. *Because I have on the sabbath, cured a man, whose whole body was disabled?* ὁτι ὁλον ανθρωπον ὑγιη εποιησα, εν σαββατῳ; E. T. *Because I have made a man every whit whole, on the sabbath day?* Dod. *That I have cured a man entirely on the sabbath?* This does not differ in meaning from the E. T. which with most other versions denotes only the completeness of the cure. All that they say, might have been said with propriety, if no more than a finger or a toe had been affected. Whereas the words ὁλον ανθρωπον ὑγιη ποιειν plainly intimate that it was not a single member only, but the whole body that was cured. Beau. seems to be the first modern interpreter who had fully expressed the sense. *De ce qu'un jour de sabbat, j'ai guéri un homme qui etoit incommodé dans tout son corps.* Our Lord doubtless alludes to the cure wrought at Bethesda, on the man who had been eight and thirty years in distress. I have changed the word *diseased*, which was perhaps too strong, for *disabled*, which is more conformable to what we learn from ch. v. 5, &c.

24. *Judge not from personal regards,* μη κρινετε κατ' οψιν. E. T. *Judge not according to the appearance.* This phrase is ambiguous. It may mean either the external circumstances of the case, or the dignity of the parties concerned; but more readily conveys to our thoughts the former, than the latter of these significations. Whereas οψις answers to the La. *facies*, and is equivalent to προσωπον, *face* or *person*. It occurs only in two other places of the N. T. ch. xi. 44. and Rev. i. 16. In the one it is rendered *face;* in the other *countenance*. It is often found in the Sep. in the same acceptation. There can be no question that this precept is of the same import with those which enjoin strict impartiality between the parties, or to have no respect of persons in judgment. The application of the precept is pretty obvious from the occasion of it. If they had been strictly impartial and equitable, they would have seen that they could not vindicate Moses for enjoining such a violation of the Sabbatical rest as was occasioned by circumcising, whilst they condemned Jesus for his miraculous cures, which required less labour, and were

not less evidently calculated for promoting a good end. Nay, they could not excuse themselves for the one practice, if Jesus was blameable for the other.

26. *That this is the Messiah*, ὅτι οὗτος ἐστιν ἀληθως ὁ Χριστος. E. T. *That this is the very Christ.* The word ἀληθως is wanting in many MSS.; amongst which are the Cam. and others of note. It is not in the Com. and some other early editions; nor has it been read by some of the primitive writers. There is no word answering to it in the Vul. Cop. Arm. Sax. and Ara. versions. The Sy. and the Eth. have each a word corresponding to it; but as they have none answering to the word ἀληθως, in the former part of the verse (for the authenticity of which there is so general a consent of MSS. fathers, and versions), there is some ground to suspect a transposition. On the whole, considering also that the word is unnecessary, and in this place rather unsuitable to the ordinary style of the writer, I thought it better to omit it.

28. *Do ye know both who and whence I am?* Κἀμὲ οἰδατε, καὶ οἰδατε ποθεν εἰμι. E. T. *Ye both know me, and ye know whence I am.* As the words are plainly capable of being read as an interrogation, it is, in every respect, most eligible to translate them so in this place. In the way they are commonly rendered, they contain a direct contradiction to what our Lord says, ch. viii. 14. 19. Nor does it satisfy, that both may be true in different senses, since these different senses do not appear from the context. Nay, in effect, he contradicts them in the same breath; inasmuch as he tells the people, that they know not him who sent him. When they said, *We know whence this man is*, the same thing was evidently meant as when they said, ch. vi. 42. *Is not this Jesus the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know?* Now, our Lord tells them plainly, that they do not know his father, and consequently, cannot tell whence (that is, of what parentage) he is. Dod. Wes. Wy. render the words here interrogatively.

[2] *He is true who sent me*, ἐστιν ἀληθινος ὁ πεμψας με. There is generally observed in the N. T. a distinction between ἀληθης and ἀληθινος, when applied to persons; the former answers to the La. *verax*, the latter to *verus*; the one means *observant of truth*, the other *genuine*. The words, therefore, are thought by Grotius,

not improbably, to suggest that *the genuine father* of Jesus, *αληθινος αυτου πατηρ*, was he who sent him; the other, whom they knew was only *νομιζομενος*, *supposed* to be his father. Others think, that as *the true God*, in contradistinction to the false Gods of the nations, is sometimes, in the sacred books, called *ὁ αληθινος θεος*, the epithet *αληθινος* is here employed to hint, to the attentive and intelligent hearers, that that Almighty Being, who alone is eminently denominated TRUE, is he who sent him. In either case, it does not appear to have been our Saviour's intention to express himself in such a manner as to be equally intelligible to all. His own disciples he brought, by little and little, to the full knowledge of his doctrine. The spiritual, like the natural, day advances gradually. Now the translator ought, as much as he can, to adopt the views of his author.

32. *The chief priests*, *οἱ αρχιερεις*. Vul. *Principes*. In conformity to this version, two MSS. of little account, read *αρχοντες*. The Sax. version follows the Vul.

33. *Jesus, therefore, said*, *ειπεν ουν αυτοις ὁ Ιησους*. E. T. *Then said Jesus unto them*. So great a number of MS. editions, versions, fathers, and critics, reject *αυτοις* in this place, as leave no reasonable ground to think, that it has originally belonged to it. When we consider also the scope of the passage, we find it would be improper; for this discourse must certainly have been directed, not to the officers of the Pharisees, but to the people.

35. *Will he go to the dispersed Greeks?* *μη εις την διασπορὰν των Ἑλληνων μελλει πορευεσθαι;* Vul. *Numquid in dispersionem Gentium iturus est?* Be. *Num ad eos qui dispersi sunt inter Græcos profecturus est?* After him E. T. *Will he go unto the dispersed among the Gentiles?* It is a manifest stretch to render the dispersion of the Greeks, *those dispersed among the Greeks;* but if this were allowable, the very next clause, *and teach the Greeks?* excludes it, for it is to them surely he goes whom he intends to teach. That *Ἕλληνες* is ever used in the N. T. for Hellenist Jews, I have seen no evidence, and am therefore now satisfied that this is the only version which the words will bear.

38. *He who believeth on me, as Scripture saith, shall prove a cistern whence rivers of living water shall flow*, *ὁ πιστευων εις εμε*

καθως ειπεν ἡ γραφη, ποταμοι εκ της κοιλιας αυτου ῥευσουσιν ὑδατος ζωντος. E. T. *He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.* As commentators have been at a loss to find the portion of Scripture here referred to, some have joined καθως ειπεν ἡ γραφη to the clause ὁ πιστευων εις εμε, which immediately precedes, and thus rendered the words, *He who believeth on me so as the Scripture hath commanded*, making the latter clause serve to qualify the former, that it may be understood that not every sort of believer is meant, but he whose belief is of such a particular kind. For my part, I do not find any insinuation in Scripture, that there are, or can be, different ways of believing. Belief may indeed have very different objects. But as to the act of the mind called *believing*, it is always mentioned in holy writ with the same simplicity that seeing, hearing, understanding, and remembering are mentioned. Nor does there appear the least suspicion in the writer, that any one of these should be misunderstood by the reader more than any other. The above mentioned is one of those criticisms which spring entirely from controversial theology: for, if there had not been previously different definitions of *faith* adopted by different parties of Christians, such a manner of interpreting the words had never been devised. Doubtless, therefore, καθως ειπεν ἡ γραφη, is to be explained in the usual way, as referring to some scriptural promise or prediction, of which what is here told would prove the accomplishment. Houbigant thinks that the passage alluded to is in one of Balaam's prophecies, Num. xxiv. 7. which he translates in this manner: *De præcordiis ejus aquæ manabunt.* He says some plausible things in support of his opinion, which it would be foreign to my purpose to examine here. I have had occasion formerly to observe, that by such phrases as καθως ειπεν ἡ γραφη, a particular passage of Scripture is not always referred to, but the scope of different passages is given.

39. *The spirit was not yet [given],* ουπω γαρ ην πνευμα ἁγιον. E. T. *For the Holy Ghost was not yet given.* Vul. *Nondum enim erat spiritus datus.* Ἁγιον is wanting in several MSS. Origen, Cyril, Hesychius, and Nonnus, seem not to have read it. There is nothing corresponding to it in the Vul. Sy. Cop. Sax. and Arm. versions. It is rejected also by some of the best modern critics. Though there is no word for *given* in the common Gr. it is in the

Vat. MS. the Vul. both the Sy. and the Sax. It seems necessary, in order to complete the sense. The evidence in its favour would otherwise be insufficient.

43. *The people were divided*, σχισμα εν τω οχλω εγενετο. Diss. X. P. III. § 2.

48. *Of the Pharisees.* Diss. IX. P. IV. § 6.

52. *Search*, ερευνησον. Vul. *Scrutari Scripturas.* The only voucher for this variation is the Cam. MS. which adds τας γραφας. No version whatever favours it.

[2] *That prophets arise not out of Galilee*, ὁτι προφητης εκ της Γαλιλαιας ουκ εγηγερται. E. T. *For out of Galilee ariseth no prophet.* A great number of MSS. read εγειρεται, and several versions, the Vul. both the Sy. the Goth. and the Sax. render the words in such a manner as though they had read so. Nonnus also says εγειρεται. But we cannot, from this, conclude, with certainty that they read so; for a freedom no greater than the change of the tense in verbs, must be sometimes taken, especially in translating a writer who uses the tenses with such peculiarity of idiom as this Evangelist. It is enough here, that it appears to have been the general sense of interpreters, that the verb was to be understood in the present. Indeed, most of the modern translators, and among the rest the Eng. have in this followed the ancient. It has not a little puzzled expositors to account for so general an assertion from the leading men of the nation, since it is highly probable that Jonah at least arose out of Galilee. On this article I observe, first, that our translators have rendered the expression more absolute than they were warranted by the Gr. It is there literally, *A prophet ariseth not.* They say, *No prophet ariseth.* There is a real difference here. The former, in common speech, denotes no more than that it is not usual; the latter, that it never happens. I have rendered it, in my opinion, more agreeably to the sense, and more suitably to our idiom by the plural number. I observe, 2dly, That men, when their passions are inflamed, are not wont to be accurate in their expressions, or distinct in recollecting, on the sudden, things which make against them. This expression of the Pharisees, therefore, whom prejudice, pride, and envy concurred in blinding, needs not appear so surprising to us. The expedient, to which Bishop Pearce and

others have recurred, of prefixing the article to προφητης, without the authority of a single MS. or of a quotation from any ancient author, is, of all resources, the worst. Here it would hurt, instead of mending, the reply. Admit that Jesus had been but a prophet, and not the Messiah, was there no crime, or was there no danger, in forming a plan to destroy him? By such a correction one would make them speak, as if it were their opinion, that they might safely take the life of an innocent man, even though a prophet of God, if he was not the Messiah. The reason of their mentioning a prophet was, because our Lord, by pretending a divine commission, had classed himself among prophets, and therefore had given reason to infer that, if he was not a prophet, he was an impostor, and, consequently, merited the fate they intended for him. For the law, Deut. xviii. 20. had expressly declared, that the prophet who should presume to speak a word in the name of God, which he had not commanded him to speak, should die. Now, they had, on their hypothesis, specious ground for making the remark, as it served to vindicate their designs against his life. But the whole of their argument is marred by making it *the prophet;* for our Lord was not yet understood to have publicly and explicitly declared himself the Messiah.

53. *Then every man went.*—See the note immediately following.

CHAPTER VIII.

1—11. The first eleven verses of this, with the concluding verse of the former chapter, containing the story of the adulteress, are wanting in a great number of MSS. Origen, Chr. The. the Gr. *catena*, though containing no fewer than three and twenty authors, have not read these twelve verses. Euth. a commentator, so late as the twelfth century, is the first who has explained them. At the same time he assures us, in his commentary, they are not to be found in the most correct copies. They were not in any good copy of either of the Sy. versions, printed or MS. till they were printed in the Eng. Polyglot, from a MS. of Archbishop Usher. They are neither in the Go. nor in the Cop. They have been long read by the Greeks in their churches, are in

most of the MSS. found with them at present ; although in some of them they are marked with asterisks or daggers, to show that they are considered as spurious. If they be an interpolation, they are a very ancient one, having been found in some copies before Origen. Some have represented them as having been transcribed from the Apocryphal Gospel according to the Hebrews; others have ascribed them to Papias, who flourished in the beginning of the second century. Many of the best critics and expositors of opposite sects have entertained strong suspicions of them. Such are Er. Olivetan, Cajetan, Bucer, Cal. Be. Gro. Ham. L. Cl. The words of Be. are remarkable ; I shall, therefore, transcribe them. "Ad me quidem quod attinet, non dissimulo mihi merito "suspectum esse quod veteres illi tanto consensu vel rejecerunt, "vel ignorarunt. Deinde quod narrat Jesum solum fuisse relict- "um cum muliere in templo, nescio quàm sit probabile : nec satis "cohæret cum eo quod mox, id est, versu duodecimo, dicitur, eos "rursum alloquutus; et quod scribit, Jesum digito scripsisse in "terra, novum mihi et insolens videtur, nec possum conjicere "quomodo possit satis commodè explicari. Tanta denique lec- "tionis varietas facit ut de totius istius narrationis fide dubitem." To the expositors above mentioned, I might almost add the Jesuit Maldonat considered in his critical capacity, though, as a true son of the church, he declares himself on the contrary side. For, after fairly deducing the evidences, which are urged for the rejection of this story, he produces, as a counterbalance, the single authority of the council of Trent, and appears to make a merit of sacrificing to it every thing that might be urged from reason on the opposite side. "Sed hæc omnia," meaning the evidences he had given of the spuriousness of the passage, "minus habent "ponderis, quam una auctoritas ecclesiæ, quæ per concilium Tri- "dentinum, non solum libros omnes quos nunc habet in usu, sed "singulas etiam ejus partes, tanquam canonicas approbavit." But in this implicit deference to authority, Maldonat has not preserved an uniform consistency. See the note on ch. xxi. 22, 23. There are some strong internal presumptions, as well as external, against the authenticity of the passage. They who desire to enter farther into the question, may consult Si.'s Crit. Hist. of the Text of the N. T. ch. xiii. and Wet. on the place. Let them also read, for the sake of impartiality, Bishop Pearce's note C. on verse 11, and his other notes and remarks on the whole story ;

and if they think with him, that all, or the chief objections made by Wet. against the authenticity of the story are fully answered, they will naturally adopt the Bishop's opinion.

6. *Was writing with his finger on the ground*, *τῳ δακτυλῳ εγραφεν εις την γην*. E. T. *With his finger wrote upon the ground, as though he heard them not.* This is one of the few instances in which our translators have deserted the common Gr. and even the La. in deference to the authority of MSS. a good number of which, and some of the early editions, after *γην* read *μη προσποιουμενος;* but this clause is not in any translation, that I have seen, of an earlier date than Dio.'s. Being, besides, quite unnecessary, I thought it better to follow the common editions both Gr. and La.

9. *They hearing that withdrew*, *οἱ δε, ακουσαντες και ὑπο της συνειδησεως ελεγχομενοι, εξηρχοντο*. E. T. *And they which heard it, being convicted by their own conscience, went out.* The clause *και ὑπο της συνειδησεως ελεγχομενοι* is wanting in many MSS. some of the best editions, and in the Vul. Sy. Sax. and Eth. versions.

10. *And seeing none but the woman*, *και μηδενα θεασαμενος πλην της γυναικος*. This clause is wanting in the Cam. and four other MSS. and also in the Vul. Sy. Sax. Cop. and Arm. versions. The sense, however, seems to require it.

[2] *Hath nobody passed sentence on thee? ουδεις σε κατεκρινεν;* E. T. *Hath no man condemned thee?*

11. *Neither do I pass sentence on thee*, *ουδε εγω σε κατακρινω*. E. T. *Neither do I condemn thee.* The Eng. word *condemn* is used with so great latitude of signification for *blaming*, *disapproving*, as well as *passing sentence against;* that I thought it better, in order to avoid occasion of mistaking, to use a periphrasis which exactly hits the meaning of the Gr. word in these two verses.

14. *My testimony ought to be regarded, because I know whence I came, and whither I go*, *Αληθης εστιν ἡ μαρτυρια μου· ὁτι οιδα ποθεν ηλθον, και που ὑπαγω*. It has been suggested (Bowyer's Conjectures) that the conjunction *ὁτι* is not, in this passage, causal, but explanatory, and introduces the testimony meant, *My record is true, that I know whence I came, and whither I am going.*

But though ὅτι is often employed for ushering in the subject, it does not suit the connection to render it so here. Had these words, *I know whence I am &c.* been the testimony to which the Pharisees alluded in the preceding verse, where they said, *Thou testifiest concerning thyself &c.* I should admit the justness of the suggestion. But when we observe, that the testimony, v. 12. *I am the light of the world &c.* which occasioned their retort, is quite different; we must be sensible, that to render the words in the way suggested, is to make our Lord's answer foreign from the purpose. It does the worse here, as this appears to be the first time that Jesus used these words, *I know whence I came &c.* If so, they could not be the testimony to which the Pharisees alluded. How, then, does our Lord's argument run, on the common interpretation? In this manner, 'Though it holds in general, that 'a man's testimony of himself, unsupported by other evidence, is 'not to be regarded; it is, nevertheless, where other testimony 'cannot be had, always received, and has that regard which the 'circumstances of the case appear to entitle it. My mission is a 'transaction between God and myself. I know whence I came, 'and whither I go; or of all that relates to the nature and end of 'my mission, I am conscious. But no other man is thus conscious; 'I can, therefore, produce no human testimony but my own; 'a testimony which will not be disregarded by those who consid-'er how strongly it is supported by the testimony of God.' (See 'v. 16, 17, 18.)

15. *Ye judge from passion,* ὑμεις κατα την σαρκα κρινετε. E. T. *Ye judge after the flesh.* Σαρξ, in the language of the N. T. is frequently used to denote the inferior powers of the soul, the passions and appetites, and is, in this meaning, opposed to πνευμα, which denotes the superior faculties of reason and conscience. Thus, κατα σαρκα περιπατειν, is to act habitually under the influence of passion and appetite. Though, from the use of the common version, we are habituated to the phrase *after the flesh,* to the much greater number it conveys no distinct meaning. It only suggests something which, in general, is bad. Diss. I. P. I. § 11. N. § 14. N.

20. *The treasury,* Mr. xii. 41. N.

24. *Ye shall die in your sins;* that is, *impenitent, hardened.* It may also denote, that they should die suffering the punishment

of their sins. In this explanation it conveys a prediction of the destruction of their city and state, in which it is not improbable that some of our Lord's hearers on this occasion, afterwards perished.

25. *The same that I told you formerly*, την αρχην ὅ, τι και λαλω ὑμιν. The E. T. is to the same purpose. *Even the same that I said unto you from the beginning:* την αρχην for κατα την αρχην, is entirely in the Gr. idiom, for *in the beginning, formerly.* In this way it is used by the Seventy, Gen. xiii. 4. xliii. 18, 20. Dan. viii. 1. In this way it is explained by Nonnus.

Ὅ τι περ ὑμιν
Ἐξ αρχης αοριζον.

In this way also it is rendered in the M. G. απο την αρχην. When we have such authority for the meaning of the word (the best of all authorities for scriptural use), I see no occasion for recourse to profane authors. Misled by these, Dod. unites the passage with the following words, v. 26. πολλα εχω περι ὑμων λαλειν και κρινειν, into one sentence, thus rendering the whole, *Truly, because I am speaking to you, I have many things to say and judge concerning you*, in which it is not in my power to discover any meaning or coherence. First, we have no answer given to the question put; 2dly, we have things introduced as cause and effect, which seem but ill fitted to stand together in that relation. Could his speaking to them be the cause of his having many things to judge concerning them? Vul. *Principium qui et loquor vobis.* For the *qui* there has no support from either Gr. MSS. or ancient versions. Nay, some ancient Lat. MSS. read *quod.*

27. *That he meant the Father*, ὅτι τον πατερα αυτοις ελεγεν. Vul. *Quia patrem ejus dicebat Deum.* The Cam. MS. adds, τον Θεον, which, with the Sax. version, seem to be in this place the only testimonies in favour of the Vul.

28. *Then ye shall know what I am*, τοτε γνωσεσθε ὅτι εγω ειμι. E. T. *Then ye shall know that I am he.* With Gro. I understand the third word as thus divided, ὅ τι, which is the same as τι, *quid, what.* In this way there is a direct reference to the question put, verse 25, *Who art thou?* It has this advantage also, that it leaves no ellipsis to be supplied for completing the sense; and the con-

nexion is both closer and clearer than in the common version. L. Cl. has taken this method in rendering the words into Fr. *Alors vous connoitrez ce que je suis.* P. R. and Sa. though translating from the Vul. which says, *quia ego sum*, go still nearer the terms of the question, and say, *qui je suis*, who I am. In Eng. the An. and Hey. follow L. Cl. as I also have done. In this way, the full import of the words is given with sufficient clearness.

33. *Some made answer*, απεκριθησαν αυτῳ. E. T. *They answered him.* The whole scope of the place shows, that it was not those believers to whom Jesus had addressed himself in the two preceding verses, who are here represented as answering. But such expressions as ελεγον, απεκριθησαν, are sometimes used indefinitely, and import only *it was said*, *it was answered.* What follows evinces that they were far from being believers who made this answer.

38. *Ye do what ye have learnt from your father*, ὑμεις ουν ὁ ἑωρακατε παρα τω πατρι ὑμων ποιειτε. E. T. *Ye do that which ye have seen with your father.* But in a considerable number of MSS. some of them of note, for ἑωρακατε, we read ηκουσατε. It was so read by Origen and Cyril. It is followed by the Eth. Cop. Go. and second Sy. versions. I agree with Bishop Pearce in thinking this reading preferable in point of propriety. It is for this reason, which is of the nature of internal evidence, that I have adopted the correction, otherwise not strongly supported.

[2] *If ye were Abraham's children, ye would act as Abraham acted*, ει τεκνα του Αβρααμ ητε, τα εργα του Αβρααμ εποιειτε αν. Vul. *Si filii Abrahæ estis, opera Abrahæ facite.* To warrant this version the original should be Αβρααμ εστε, τα εργα του Αβρααμ ποιειτε. Yet there is no MS. which reads entirely in this manner.

43. *It is because ye cannot bear my doctrine*, ὁτι ου δυνασθε ακουειν λογον τον εμον. E. T. *Even because ye cannot hear my word.* The verb ακουειν denotes frequently in Scripture, and even in profane authors, not barely *to hear*, but *to hear patiently*; consequently *not to hear* often means *not to bear.* The Eng. verb, *to hear*, has sometimes, I acknowledge, the same meaning, but more rarely: and in consequence of the uncommonness, the literal version has somewhat of an ambiguous appearance which the original has not. The An. Hey. and Wor. have all avoided the ambiguity, though not quite in the same manner.

44. *He was a manslayer*, εκεινος ανθρωποκτονος ην. E. T. *He was a murderer.* The common term for murderer in the N. T. is φονευς. I have here made choice of a less usual name, not from any disposition to trace etymologies, but because I think it is not without intention, that the devil, a being not of earthly extraction, is rather called ανθροποκτονος than φονευς as marking, with greater precision, his ancient enmity to the human race. When the name *murderer* is applied to a rational being of a species different from ours, it naturally suggests that the being so denominated is a destroyer of others of his own species. As this is not meant here, the Evangelist's term is peculiarly apposite. At the same time I am sensible, that our word *manslaughter* means, in the language of the law, such killing as is indeed criminal, though not so atrocious as *murder.* But in common use it is not so limited. Hey. says, to the same purpose, *a slayer of men.*

45. *Because I speak the truth, ye do not believe me*, ὁτι την αληθειαν λεγω, ου πιστευετε μοι. Vul. *Si veritatem dico non creditis mihi.* This version, one would almost think, must have arisen from a different reading, though there is none entirely conformable to it in the known MSS. and versions. It may, indeed, be thought an objection against the common reading, that there is something like exaggeration in the sentiment. How is it possible that a man's reason for not believing what is told him, should be *that it is true?* That this should be his known or acknowledged reason, is certainly impossible. To think or perceive a thing to be true, and to believe it, are expressions entirely synonymous. In this way explained, it would, no doubt, be a contradiction in terms. The truth of the matter may, nevertheless, be the real, though, with regard to himself, the unknown, cause of his unbelief. A man's mind may, by gross errors, and inveterate prejudices, be so alienated from the simplicity of truth, that the silliest paradoxes, or wildest extravagancies, in opinion, shall have a better chance of gaining his assent, than truths almost self-evident. And this is all that, in strictness, is implied in the reproach.

46. *Which of you convicteth me?* τις εξ ὑμων ελεγχει με; E. T. *Which of you convinceth me?* The word *convinceth* is not the proper term in this place. It relates only to the opinion of the person himself about whom the question is. Our Lord here, in

order to show that the unbelief of his hearers had no reasonable excuse, challenges them openly, to *convict* him, if they can, in any instance, of a deviation from truth. The import of this is, bring evidence of such a deviation, evince it to the world. A man may be convinced, that is not convicted. Nay, it is even possible that a man may be convicted, who is not convinced. I am astonished that Dod. has missed observing this distinction. He is almost the only modern translator into Eng. who has missed it.

[2] *Of falsehood*, *περι αμαρτιας*. E. T. *Of sin*. *Αμαρτια* not only signifies *sin*, in the largest acceptation, but *error*, *falsehood*, a departure from truth. Its being contrasted here to *αληθεια*, fixes it to this sense. It immediately follows. *And if I speak truth, why do ye not believe me?*

51. *Shall never see death*, *θανατον ου μη θεωρηση εις τον αιωνα*. Hey. *Shall not die for ever*. This is at least a very unusual expression. If *not for ever* do not here mean, *never*, it would not be easy, from the known laws of the language, to assign its precise meaning. But the sense, say they, is, *He shall not perish eternally. He shall not suffer eternal death.* I admit that this is the meaning which our Lord had to the expression which he then used. But this meaning is as clearly conveyed in the E. T. as in the Gr. original. Now, if we could make the expression clearer in Eng. than it is in the Gr. we ought not, in the present case, to do it; because we cannot do it, without hurting the scope of the writer in recording this dialogue, which shows the manner wherein our Lord, whilst he taught his faithful followers, was misunderstood by his enemies. The probability, nay, even the possibility, of some of their mistakes will be destroyed, if his expressions be totally divested of their darkness, or even ambiguity. Our Lord spoke, doubtless, of eternal death, when he said, *θανατον ου μη θεωρηση*, but, it is certain, that he was understood by most of his hearers as speaking of natural death; the words then ought to be susceptible of this interpretation. He perceived their mistake, but did not think proper to make any change on his language. The only equivocal word here is *θανατος*, *death*. *Εις τον αιωνα*, with a negative particle, when the sense is not confined by the verb, has invariably the same meaning, which is *never*. See Mt. xxi. 19. Mr. iii. 29. J. iv. 14. x. 28. xiii. 8. 1 Cor. viii. 13. I said, when the sense is

not confined by the verb, because when the verb implies duration, the meaning of the phrase is different; for it then denotes *not always, not perpetually.* We have an example in this chapter, verse 35 *ὁ δε δουλος ου μενει εν τῃ οικια εις τον αιωνα. Now the slave abideth not in the family perpetually.* These two, *never* and *not perpetually*, are the only acceptations in Scripture I have discovered of the phrase. Now it cannot be the latter of these that has been meant by Hey.; and if the former, he has not been happy in the choice of an expression, ch. ix. 32. N.

55. *speak falsely.* Diss. III. § 24.

56. *Longed to see my day, ηγαλλιασατο ἱνα ιδῃ την ἡμεραν την εμην.* E. T. *Rejoiced to see my day.* The words *ἱνα ιδῃ*, immediately following *ηγαλλιασατο*, show that it cannot mean here *rejoiced*, but *desired* earnestly, *wished, longed.* It is so rendered by the Sy. מסוה. Nonnus, to the same purpose,

Ἡμαρ ἐμον πολυευκτον ἰδειν ηγαλλετο θυμῳ.

The Vul. Er. and Zu. say *exultavit*, but both Cas. and Be. *gestivit.* L. Cl. Beau. and almost all the late Eng. interpreters; nay, and even the most eminent Fr. translators from the Vul. as P. R. Sa. and Si. follow in this the interpretation of Be. and Cas.

2 *He saw.* His faith was equivalent to seeing.

57. *And thou hast seen Abraham? και Αβρααμ ἑωρακας*; E. T. *And hast thou seen Abraham?* The form I have given to the interrogation which is still retained, is more expressive of the derisive manner in which the question seems to have been put. Mt. xxvii. 11. with the N.

58. *Before Abraham was born; I am. πριν Αβρααμ γενεσθαι, εγω ειμι.* E. T. *Before Abraham was, I am.* I have followed here the version of Er. which is close both to the sense and to the letter: *Antequam Abraham nasceretur, ego sum.* Dio. renders the words in the same way in Italian: *Avànti che Abraam fosse nato, io sono.* Dod. Hey. and Wy. translate in Eng. in the same manner. *Εγω ειμι* may indeed be rendered *I was.* The present, for the imperfect, or even for the preterperfect, is no unusual figure with this writer. However, as an uninterrupted duration from

the time spoken of to the time then present, seems to have been suggested, I thought it better to follow the common method.

59. The E. T. adds, *and so passed by.* In the common Greek we have *και παρηγεν ουτως.* But these words are not in the Cam. MS. nor in some of the early editions. There is nothing corresponding to them in the Sy. Vul. or Sax. versions. Cas. and Lu. have them not. Be. considers both this, and the clause immediately preceding, to wit, *passing through the midst of them*, which is also wanting in the Vul. Arm. and Sax. versions, as mere interpolations. He has nevertheless, retained them in his translation. They are rejected by Gro. and Mill. It may be said that one of these clauses at least (if not both) adds nothing to the sense: they have much the appearance of having been copied from other Gospels.

CHAPTER IX.

2. *Who sinned; this man, or his parents, that he was born blind?* Diss. VI. P. II. § 19.

7. *Wash thine eyes in the pool of Siloam, νιψαι εις την κολυμβηθραν του Σιλωαμ.* E. T. *Wash in the pool of Siloam.* There are two words which occur in the N. T. in the sense of *washing* or *bathing;* yet they are not synonymous, though we have not terms which correspond so exactly as to mark the distinction between them. The words are *νιπτειν* and *λουειν.* The former, *νιπτειν*, or rather *νιπτεσθαι* (for the middle voice is more used), denotes to wash or bathe a part only of the body; the latter, *λουειν*, is to wash or bathe the whole body. This difference, if I mistake not, is uniformly observed in the N. T. Thus, Mt. vi. 17. *το προσωπον σου νιψαι* xv. 2. *ου νιπτονται τας χειρας αυτων.* And in this Gospel the distinction is expressly marked, ch. xiii. 10. *ὁ λελουμενος ου χρειαν εχει η τους ποδας νιψασθαι*, where the participle *λελουμενος* is used of him whose whole body is washed; and the verb *νιψασθαι* is joined with *τους ποδας.* That the verb *λουειν* is commonly used in the manner mentioned, see Acts ix. 37. Heb. x. 23. 2 Pet. ii. 22. Rev. i. 5. In all which, whether the words be used literally or metaphorically, the complete cleansing of the body or person is meant. There is only one pas-

sage about which there can be any doubt. It is in Acts, xvi. 33. where the jailer, upon his conversion by Paul and Silas, prisoners committed to his custody, is said in the E. T. to have washed their stripes. The verb is *ελουσεν*. But let it be observed that this is not an accurate version of the Gr. phrase *ελουσεν απο των πληγων*, which, in my opinion, implies bathing the whole body, for the sake both of cleaning their wounds, and administering some relief to their persons. The accusative to the active verb *ελουσεν* is evidently *τα σωματα* understood. The full expression is *ελουσε τα σωματα αυτων απο των πληγων*. The same distinction between the words is well observed in the Sep. The word *wash*, in Eng. when used as a neuter verb, without a regimen, is commonly, if not always, understood to relate to the whole body. The word *νιψαι* shows, on the contrary, that the sacred author meant only a part. That the part meant is *the eyes*, is manifest from the context. Not to supply them, therefore, in Eng. is in effect to alter the sense. Nonnus, agreeably to this exposition, says *νιπτε τεον ρεθος*. And when the man himself relates to the people, verse 11, how he had been cured, Nonnus thus expresses this circumstance :

Νιψαμενος σκιεροιο περιτροχον ομματος ὑλην.

And afterwards, verse 15, to the Pharisees he says, *ὑδατι πηλον ενιψα*. Mr. vii. 3, 4. N.

8. *They who had before seen him blind*, *οἱ θεωρουντες αυτον το προτερον ὁτι τυφλος ην*. Vul. *Qui viderunt eum prius quia mendicus erat*. Conformable to this are the Al. Cam. and several other MSS. which, instead of *τυφλος*, read *προσαιτης*. Most of the ancient versions agree in this with the Vul. It makes no material difference in the story.

9. *Others*, *He is like him*, *αλλοι δε*, *ὁτι ὁμοιος αυτῳ εστιν*. Vul. *Alii autem*, *Nequaquam*, *sed similis est ei*. In conformity to this, four MSS. instead of *ὁτι* read *ουχι αλλ'*. The Sy. and some other versions agree also with the Vul.

16. *Σχισμα ην εν αυτοις*. Diss. IX. P. III. § 2.

17. *What sayest thou of him for giving thee sight ?* *Συ τι λεγεις περι αυτου*, *ὁτι ηνοιξε σου τους οφθαλμους* ; E. T. *What sayest thou of him*, *that he hath opened thine eyes ?* Vul. *Tu quid dicis de illu qui aperuit oculos tuos ?* It would appear that the La. trans-

lator has read ὁς for ὅτι. It suits the sense very well, but has no support from MSS. versions, or ancient authors. The common reading is unexceptionable; but the expression in the E. T. does not convey the meaning so distinctly as could be wished. The sense is well expressed by Ham. in his paraphrase. "What opin-"ion of him hath this work of power and mercy to thee, wrought "in thee?"

22. *Should be expelled the synagogue*, αποσυναγωγος γενηται. This corresponds, in their discipline, to what we call *excommunication*.

24. *Give glory to God*, Δος δοξαν τῳ Θεῳ. This does not mean, as is commonly supposed, 'Give God the praise for thy 'cure.' The import is, 'Glorify God by confessing ingenuously 'the truth.' This expression shows that they believed, or affected to believe, that he had told them lies, and that they wanted to extort a confession from him. It was the expression used by Joshua, ch. vii. 18, 19. to Achan, when he would induce him to confess his guilt in relation to the accursed thing. It was adopted afterwards by the judges, for adjuring those accused or suspected of crimes to acknowledge the truth as in the sight of God. What follows entirely suits this sense. Their speech is to this effect: 'You cannot impose upon us by this incredible story. 'We know that the man you speak of, who openly profanes the 'Sabbath, is a transgressor, and therefore can have no authority 'or commission from God; It will, therefore, be the wisest thing 'you can do, to confess the truth honestly, as thereby you will 'give glory to God.' It would appear from their tampering so much with this man, that they hoped by his means to detect some fraud or collusion, by the use of which our Lord had procured so extraordinary a fame for working miracles. But being disappointed in their expectations from him, they were so incensed that they resolved immediately to excommunicate him.

27. *Did ye not hear?* και ουκ ηκουσατε; E. T. *And ye did not hear.* Vul. *Et audistis.* This translator has read και ηκουσατε; a reading which has no support from antiquity, except the Sax. version. I think the clause ought to be read as a question, a manner frequent in this Gospel. If it be rendered in the common way, it must mean, 'Ye did not mind what was told you. If so, the verb ακουειν is used twice in the same verse in senses to-

tally different. Such an interpretation as supposes this, unless when a paronomasia is evidently intended, ought to be avoided as much as possible.

32. *Never was it heard before*, εκ του αιωνος ουκ ηκουσθη. Απ' αιωνος, or εκ του αιωνος, is a literal version frequently occurring in the Sep. of the Heb. word מעולם in like manner as εις τον αιωνα, or έως του αιωνος is of לעולם. The former strictly means *from eternity*, the latter *to eternity*. In this sense they are applied to God, Ps. xc. 2. But in popular language, the former often denotes no more than from the beginning of the world, or even from very early times; and εις τον αιωνα does not always mean *to eternity*, in the strict sense of the word. That the use is nearly the same in pagan writers, has been very well shown by Wet. The meaning of neither phrase, when accompanied with a negative, admits much variation. The one is *antehac nunquam*, *never before*; the other *nunquam dehinc*, *never after*. In regard to the latter, an exception was taken notice of, on ch. viii. 51. Such an interpretation as *from the age*, which some have proposed, conveys no meaning where no particular age has been spoken of. Nor is there any age of the world, that appears to have been distinguished in Scripture, as *the age*, by way of eminence. But a great deal of the reasoning used in criticism, especially scriptural criticism, is merely hypothetical.

34. *Thou wast altogether born in sins, and dost thou teach us?* This reproach proceeded from the same general principle from which the question of the disciples, verse 2. arose.

CHAPTER X.

2. *The shepherd always entereth by the door*, ὁ δε εισερχομενος δια της θυρας, ποιμην εστι των προβατων. E. T. *He that entereth in by the door is the shepherd of the sheep.* This mode of speaking with us conveys the notion, that the shepherd is the only person who enters by the door; yet the owner, the door-keeper, and the sheep themselves, also enter the same way. The original expression is manifestly intended to denote the constant, not the peculiar use which the shepherd makes of the door, as opposed to the constant use of thieves and robbers to force their entrance,

by breaking or climbing over the fence. The comparison is made not to the folds used by the common people in remote parts of the country, but to those belonging to the rich in the neighbourhood of a populous city, where the walls and other fences need to be stronger, and the entrance more carefully kept, on account of the greater danger from thieves.

8. *All who have entered in another manner*, παντες ὁσοι προ εμου ηλθον. E. T. *All that ever came before me.* But there is a remarkable difference of reading on this passage. The words προ εμου, on which the meaning of the sentence entirely depends, are wanting in some of the most ancient, and in a very great number of other MSS. There is nothing corresponding to them in the Vul. which says simply, *Omnes quotquot venerunt.* The first Sy. in like manner has them not; the second Sy. has an expression answering to them; but it is marked, as spurious, with an asterisk. Neither the Go. nor the Sax. has them. They are wanting in the Com. and some other early editions. Most of the ancient expositors appear not to have read them. Some however, have. Among these is Nonnus, who says, παντες ὁσοι παρος ηλθον. This is the state of the external evidence, with regard to the words in question. And if it be found such as to leave the mind in suspense about their authenticity, the internal evidence against them does, in my opinion, turn the scale. When our Lord, in explaining his public character, uses a comparison introduced by the words *I am*, it is always his manner to suit what he next says of himself, to that, whatever it be, he has chosen to be represented by. Of this we have several examples in this Gospel. Thus, when he says, ch. vi. 51. *I am the living bread which descended from heaven*, it is immediately added, *Whoso eateth of this bread*—This perfectly suits the comparison adopted; for *bread* is baked to be *eaten.* Again, ch. xiv. 6. *I am the way, and the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father but by me* [who am *the way*]. Again, ch. xv. 1. *I am the true vine, and my father is the vine-dresser.* It is added, *Every barren branch in me* [*the vine*] *he loppeth off.* To come to the contex, verse 11. *I am the good shepherd;* it follows, *the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep;* and, lastly, verse 9. *I am the door; such as enter by me* [*the door*] *shall be safe.*——Now to this manner, so uniformly observed, the words under examination cannot be reconciled. *I am the*

door, all that ever came before me, προ μου, that is, before I *the door came*. But do we ever speak of *a door's coming* to any place? This is so far from illustrating the meaning, that it is inconsistent with any meaning, and therefore leads the mind to devise some other image which may suit the words here used. Such indeed, is that employed, verse 11. where our Lord calls himself *the shepherd*. But by no rule of interpretation can we borrow light from a circumstance which had not yet been mentioned. Of this incoherence Maldonat, though he explains the words differently, was entirely sensible. *Non videntur hæc enim*, says he, *cum præcedenti versu satis apte conjungi. Si enim dixisset se pastorem esse, commode et apposite adderet alios non pastores sed fures et latrones fuisse; cum autem dixerit se esse ostium, non apparet qua ratione, qua consequentia addat alios fuisse latrones.* But, beside this unsuitableness to the context, the meaning expressed by ὅσοι προ εμου ηλθον, appears exceptionable. Who were those that came before him? Not Moses and the Prophets, surely. For of these our Lord, far from calling them *thieves and robbers*, always speaks honourably. Yet to these we should otherwise most readily apply the expression, especially when we consider that Jesus styles them to his disciples, *the prophets who were before you*. 'The persons here meant,' say some, 'are those who, 'before his time, assumed the character of Messiah.' But who were these? It does not appear from any history, sacred or profane, that any person, before his time, ever assumed the character or title of Messiah. Afterwards, indeed, agreeably to our Lord's prediction, it was assumed by many. Theudas and Judas of Galilee cannot be meant. They were rather contemporaries. And though both were seditious leaders, and gave themselves out for extraordinary personages, we have no evidence that either of them pretended to be the Messiah. For all these reasons, I think προ εμου ought to be rejected as an interpolation. The external evidence, or what I may call the testimonies in its favour, are at least counterbalanced by those against it; and the internal evidence arising from the sense of the expression, and the scope of the passage, is all on the contrary side. I read, therefore, with the Sy. the Vul. and, I may add, the old Italic, of which the Sax. is esteemed by critics a literal translation, παντες ὅσοι ηλθον. I consider ηλθον as used here for εισηλθον, the simple for the compound, used verse 1. and the word αλλαχοθεν under-

stood as supplied from that verse. It is not unusual, when there is occasion for repeating a sentiment which has been advanced a little before, to abridge the expression, on the supposition that what is wanting the hearers will supply from memory. It will perhaps be objected to this explanation, that it makes this sentence a mere repetition of what is said in verse 1st. I own that the affirmation in verse 1st is here repeated, but not merely so, as it is attended with a very important explanation. The import of the two verses, which will show exactly their relation, may be thus expressed: 1. 'They who enter the fold otherwise than by the door, are thieves and robbers. 7. I am the door. 8. Consequently they who enter otherwise than by me, are thieves and robbers.' This makes the eighth verse, as it were the conclusion of a syllogism, of which the first and the seventh are the premises. It is remarkable that this has appeared to be the general import of the passage, even to those interpreters who seem either not to have known how it could be deduced, or have attempted a method absolutely indefensible. Dr. Clarke (see his paraphrase of verse 8.) gives a sense to the words which coincides with that here given; but he does not inform us how he makes it out, or in what manner he read the original. Elsner has endeavoured to draw the same meaning from the reading in the common Gr.; but in my judgment, without success. *Ερχεσθαι προ θυρας* for *to go past a door*, is, I suspect, utterly unexampled. Besides, who was ever accounted either thief or robber, for *going past the door*, if he did not attempt to break into the enclosure? But it may be said, if the words *προ εμου* ought to be rejected, how shall we account for their introduction into so many copies? To this I can only reply, that the misapprehension of the sense, in some early transcriber, may not improbably have led him to take this method of supplying the ellipsis. It is in this manner that the greatest freedoms which have been taken with the sacred text are to be accounted for. Upon the whole, our Lord, when he compares himself to a shepherd, speaks in the character of the great prophet or teacher of God's people; when he compares himself to the door of the sheep-fold, he signifies that it is by him, that is, by sharing in his grace, and partaking of his spirit, that the under-shepherds and teachers must be admitted into his fold, that is, into his church or kingdom, and participate in all the spiritual blessings belonging to its members. In this view, the words

are directed chiefly against the Scribes and Pharisees, considered as teachers, whose doctrine was far from breathing the same spirit with his, and whose chief object was, not like that of the good shepherd, to feed and to protect the flock, but, like that of the robber, or of the wolf, to devour them. I shall only add, before I conclude this note, that the interpretation here given suits the words that follow, as well as those that precede. Thus, "7. I am "the door. 8. All who enter in another manner are thieves and "robbers. 9. All who enter by me, shall be safe." How common was this method with our Lord, to enforce his sentiments by affirmations and negations thus connected!

14, 15. *I both know my own, and am known by them (even as the Father knoweth me, and I know the Father); and I give my life for the sheep.* Ch. vi. 57. N. Diss. XII. P. IV. § 3.

16. *I have other sheep besides, which are not of this fold.* This is spoken of the Gentiles, who were afterwards to be received into his church on the same footing with the Jews.

18. *No one forceth it from me, ουδεις αιρει αυτην απ' εμου.* E. T. *No man taketh it from me.* This can hardly be said with propriety, since he suffered by the hands of others. The Eng. verb *take*, does not express the full import of the Greek *αιρεω*. In this place it is evidently our Lord's intention to inform his hearers, that his enemies could not, by violence, take his life, if he did not voluntarily put himself in their power.

22. *The feast of the dedication, τα εγκαινια.* It might be rendered, more literally, *the feast of the renovation.* But the other name has obtained the sanction of use. This festival was instituted by Judas Maccabæus, 1 Mac. iv. 59. in memory of their pulling down the altar of burnt offerings, which had been profaned by the Pagans, and building a new one, dedicated to the true God.

[2] *It being winter, χειμων ην.* This festival began on the twenty-fifth of the month *Casleu*, and was kept for eight days. It fell about the middle of our *December*.

25. *I said to you, but ye believed not, "the works which I do in "my father's name, testify of me," ειπον υμιν και ου πιστευετε· τα εργα ἁ εγω ποιω εν τω ονοματι του πατρος μου, ταυτα μαρτυρει περι εμου.* E. T. *I told you, and ye believed not: the works*

that I do in my father's name, they bear witness of me. The words are capable of being rendered either way; but there is this difference: rendered in the one way, they are conformable to fact, as appears from this very Gospel—"I said to you, the works "which I do," &c. That he had said this, we learn from ch. v. 36. In the other way rendered, the words "I told you," can refer only to what they asked him to tell them, to wit, whether he were the Messiah or not. Now, it does not appear from this, or from any other Gospel, that he had ever told them this in express terms, as they wanted him to do. It may be proper to observe, that the Vul. is here, in respect of the sense, agreeable to the version I have given; but, in respect of the expression, plainly points out a different reading. *Loquor vobis, et non creditis, opera quæ ego facio in nomine patris mei, hæc testimonium perhibent de me.* In conformity to this the Cam. MS. alone, reads λαλω for ειπον.

26, 27. *Ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep. My sheep, as I told you, obey my voice.* ου πιστευετε· ου γαρ εστε εκ των προβατων των εμων, καθως ειπον ὑμιν. Τα προβατα τα εμα της φωνης μου ακουει. E. T. *Ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you. My sheep hear my voice.* This case is similar to the former: καθως ειπον ὑμιν is joined, by our translators, to the preceding words; I join them to those which follow. My reason is the same as in the foregoing instance. The words which precede, had not, as far as we are informed, been expressly used by our Lord; the subsequent words had. On the common Gr. there is no change made but in the pointing. Indeed, the clause καθως ειπον ὑμιν, which has occasioned the question, is wanting in several MSS. as well as in the Vul. Cop. Arm. and Sax. versions. To recur to the authority of later interpreters and critics, would, in so plain a case, be quite unnecessary.

29. *My Father, who gave them me is greater than all,* ὁ πατηρ μου ὃς δεδωκε μοι μειζων παντων εστι. Vul. *Pater meus, quod dedit mihi, majus omnibus est.* There is nothing in the Gr. MSS. which can confer the least probability on this version of the La. interpreter. Two or three MSS. have ὁ for ὃς. The Al. reads μειζον for μειζων. The Cop. and Sax. versions agree with the Vul.

30. *I and the Father are one, εγω και ὁ πατηρ ἑν εσμεν.* The word is not *εἷς, one person*, but *ἑν, one thing*, or the same thing. It might have been so rendered here; but the expression is too homely, in the opinion of some excellent critics, to suit the dignity of the subject. The greater part of foreign interpreters have thought otherwise. Vul. Er. Zu. Cas. Be. *Ego et pater unum sumus.* Lu. Ich und der Vater sind eins. Dio. *Io e il padre siamo una istessa cosa.* L. Cl. *Mon pere et moi sommes une seule chose.* P. R. Si. and Sa. *Une meme chose.* What is distinguished in the original, we ought, if possible, to distinguish. Yet no Eng. translator known to me has, in this, chosen to desert the common translation.

34. *Is it not written in your law?* Here we find the book of Psalms, whence the passage quoted is taken, included under the name *law*, which is sometimes used for the whole Scriptures of the O. T.

35. *To whom the word of God was addressed, προος ὡς ὁ λογος του Θεου εγενετο.* It has been observed justly, that the words may be rendered, *against whom the word of God was pointed.* What gives countenance to this interpretation, is, that God, in the place quoted (Ps. lxxxii. 6.) is severely rebuking and threatening wicked judges and magistrates. On the whole, however, I prefer the version here given.

[2] *And if the language of Scripture is unexceptionable—και ου δυναται λυθηναι ἡ γραφη.*—E. T. *And the Scripture cannot be broken.* I do not know a meaning which, by any of the received laws of interpretation, we can affix to this expression, *Scripture cannot be broken.* Yet it is impossible for one who attends to our Lord's argument, as it runs in the original, to entertain a doubt about the clause which answers to it in the Gr. Our Lord defends what he had said from the charge of blasphemy, by showing its conformity to the style of Scripture in less urgent cases: insomuch that, if the propriety of Scripture language be admitted, the propriety of his must be admitted also. This is one of those instances wherein, though it is very easy for the translator to discover the meaning, it is very difficult to express it in words which shall appear to correspond to those of his author. In such cases, a little circumlocution has always been allowed.

36. *Whom the Father hath consecrated his Apostle to the world*, ὃν ὁ πατηρ ἡγιασε και απεστειλεν εις τον κοσμον. E. T. *Whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world.* That ἁγιαζειν, in Scripture, often denotes *to consecrate*, to set apart to any religious or important purpose, has been shown, Diss. VI. P. IV. § 9—13. It is evident, that it is only in this sense applicable here. There are two words which Jesus chiefly uses for expressing his mission. One is, πεμπω, the other αποστελλω; the former a more familiar, the latter a more solemn, term. It is from the latter that the name *Apostle* is derived. Our Lord, in my opinion, has often an allusion to this title, when it does not appear in the E. T. because both words are promiscuously rendered *send.* And though here the word *send* does but feebly express the import of the original; for it may be said of every man, that God hath *sent* him into the world; I do not deny that, in most cases, both words are properly so rendered, and that the purport of the sentence is justly conveyed. In a few, however, where there seems to be an allusion to the title αποστολοι, by which he had distinguished the twelve, it may be allowable to change the term for the sake of preserving the allusion. Thus, ch. xvii. 18. when our Lord, in an address to God, represents the mission of his Apostles by him, as analogous to that which he had himself received from his heavenly Father, he uses these emphatical words: *Καθως εμε απεστειλας εις τον κοσμον, καγω απεστειλα αυτους εις τον κοσμον.* I have, for the sake of exhibiting the analogy with like energy, rendered the words in this manner: *as thou hast made me thy Apostle to the world, I have made them my Apostles to the world.* Jesus is accordingly called, Heb. iii. 1. *the Apostle and High Priest of our profession.* He is the Apostle of God; they were the Apostles of Christ. Hence appears more strongly the propriety of what he said, L. x. 16. *He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me.* Thus making them, in respect of their mission as teachers, stand in the same relation to him, in which he, as Heaven's interpreter, stood to God. In like manner, in the verse under examination, as the word ἡγιασε evidently means *consecrated*, or set apart for a sacred office, ἡγιασε και απεστειλεν is, by a common idiom, used for ἡγιασε του αποστελλεσθαι; or, which is the same, ἡγιασεν ειναι αποστολον.

2 *For calling himself his son*, ὁτι ειπον, υἱος του Θεου ειμι. E. T. *Because I said, I am the Son of God.* Let it be observed, that our Lord's word here is υἱος, not ὁ υἱος. It is not, therefore, so definite as the common version makes it. At the same time, the want of the article in Gr. (as I have elsewhere observed) does not render the words so expressly indefinite, as, in our language, the indefinite article would render them, if the expression were translated *a Son of God.* For the sake, therefore, of avoiding an error on either side, I have chosen this oblique manner of expressing the sentiment. Mt. xxvii. 54. N.

39. *They attempted again*—εζητουν παλιν—. The Vul. has no word answering to παλιν, which is also omitted by the Cam. and a few other MSS.

CHAPTER XI.

4. *Will not prove fatal*, ουκ εστι προς θανατον. E. T. *Is not unto death.* That the former way of rendering gives the full import of the Gr. expression, as used here, cannot be questioned. It, at the same time, preserves the ambiguity.

10. *Because there is no light*, ὁτι το φως ουκ εστιν εν αυτῳ. E. T. *Because there is no light in him.* Knatchbull has very properly observed, that the pronoun αυτῳ, here, manifestly refers to the noun κοσμου, in the end of the preceding verse; and should, therefore, be rendered *in it.* Common sense, as well as the rules of construction, require this interpretation. His stumbling in the night, is occasioned by the want of that which prevents his stumbling in the day. *In it*, however, is better omitted in Eng. where it would encumber, rather than enlighten, the expression, of itself sufficiently clear.

25. *I am the resurrection and the life;* that is, 'I am the author 'of the resurrection and of the life'—a very common trope in Scripture of the effect for the efficient. In this way, God is called *our salvation*, to denote *our Saviour;* and Jesus Christ is said, 1 Cor. i. 30. to be made of God unto us, *wisdom*, and *righteousness*, and *sanctification*, and *redemption;* that is, the source of these blessings.

27. *Thou art the Messiah, the Son of God, he who cometh into the world*, συ ει ὁ Χριστος, ὁ υἱος του Θεου, ὁ εἰς τον κοσμον ερχομενος. E. T. *Thou art the Christ, the Son of God, which should come into the world.* I have had occasion to take notice (in another place, Diss. V. P. IV. § 3—6. 14.) of the three titles just now mentioned, as different denominations or descriptions by which the same great personage was distinguished. I have, therefore, kept them distinct. The two last are, as it were, compounded into one in the E. T. I have also observed, that the proper title is not *he who should come*, but *he who cometh.* It was very natural in Mary, when professing her faith in Jesus, in consequence of the question so publicly put to her, to mention all the principal titles appropriated to him in Scripture.

37. *Who gave sight to the blind man*, ὁ ανοιξας τους οφθαλμους του τυφλου. Vul. *Qui aperuit oculos cæci nati.* E. T. *Which opened the eyes of the blind.* There is no Gr. MS. yet known which authorises the addition of *nati*, nor any version but the Cop. The singular number, with the article, here employed by the Evangelist, shows a manifest allusion to one individual. Οἱ τυφλοι is properly *the blind*, which, when no substantive is added, is understood to be plural.

38. *Shut up with a stone*, λιθος επεκειτο επ' αυτῳ. E. T. *A stone lay upon it.* From the way in which the words are rendered in the Sy. version, and from a regard to a just remark of Si. that the preposition επι, in the Hellenistic idiom, does not always imply *upon*, or *over*, I have been induced to render the expression in the manner above mentioned: it being not improbable, that, in this respect, the sepulchre was similar to our Lord's.

39. *For this is the fourth day*, τεταρταιος γαρ εστι. E. T. *For he hath been dead four days.* The expression is abrupt and elliptical; a manner extremely natural to those in grief, and, therefore, where it is possible, worthy to be imitated by a translator.

41. *Then they removed the stone*, ηραν ουν τον λιθον ὅ ην ὁ τεθνηκως κειμενος. The last clause, ὅ ην ὁ τεθνηκως κειμενος, is wanting altogether in the Vul. the Sy. the Sax. the Arm. the Eth. the Ara. and the Cop. versions, as well as in some noted MSS. The words, ὁ τεθνηκως κειμενος, are wanting in the Go. and the second Sy. versions, and in the Al. MS. which reads ὅ η after λι-

θον. Nonnus omits the clause entirely. It is rejected by Origen, Mill, and Bengelius; and plainly adds nothing to the sense.

45. The Vul. after *Mariam*, adds *et Martham*, in which it is singular.

49. *Caiaphas, who was high priest that year.* L. iii. 2. N.

[2] *Ye are utterly at a loss,* ὑμεις οὐκ οιδατε οὐδεν. E. T. *Ye know nothing at all.* It is manifest, from the whole scope of the passage, that it is not with the ignorance of the subject about which they were deliberating, the doctrine and miracles of our Lord, nor with the ignorance of the law for the punishment of offenders of all denominations, that Caiaphas here upbraids them. Accordingly, we do not find, in what he says, any thing tending to give the smallest information on either of these heads. Yet something of this kind is what occurs as the meaning, on first reading the words in most translations. But what he upbraids them with here, is plainly the want of political wisdom. They were in perplexity; they knew not what to resolve upon, or what measure to adopt, in a case which, as he pretended, was extremely clear. It would appear, that some of the sanhedrim were sensible that Jesus had given them no just or legal handle, by any thing he had either done or taught, for taking away his life; and that, in their deliberations on the subject, something had been advanced, which made the high priest fear they would not enter with spirit and resolution into the business. He, therefore, seems here to concede to those who appeared to have scruples, that, though their putting Jesus to death could not be vindicated by strict law or justice, it might be vindicated from expediency and reason of state, or, rather, from the great law of necessity, the danger being no less than the destruction of their country, and so imminent, that even the murder of an innocent man, admitting Jesus to be innocent, was not to be considered as an evil, but rather as a sacrifice, every way proper for the safety of the nation. May we not reasonably conjecture, that such a manner of arguing must have arisen from objections made by Nicodemus, who, as we learn from ch. vii. 50, &c. was not afraid to object to them the illegality of their proceedings, or by Joseph of Arimathea, who was, probably, one of them, and concerning whom we have this honourable testimony, L. xxiii. 50, 51. that he did not concur in their resolutions.

56. *What think ye? Will he not come to the festival? Τι δοκει υμιν, οτι ου μη ελθη εις την εορτην;* E. T. *What think ye, that he will not come to the feast?* This looks as if they knew, or took for granted, that he would not come, and were inquiring only about the reason of his not coming. This is not the meaning of the Evangelist, whose words, in the judgment of the best critics, make properly two questions, and ought to be pointed thus—*Τι δοκει υμιν;—οτι ου μη ελθη εις την εορτην;*

CHAPTER XII.

7. *Let her alone. She hath reserved this——Αφες αυτην——τετηρηκεν αυτο.* Five MSS. read *ινα τηρηση.* The Vul. in conformity to this, *Sinite illam ut servet illud.* With this, agree also, the Sax. Cop. and Eth. versions, and the paraphrase of Nonnus. But when the common reading makes a clear sense, which suits the context, the authorities just now mentioned are by no means a sufficient reason for changing.

[2] *To embalm me.* Ch. xix. 40. N.

10. *Determined, εβουλευσαντο.* E. T. *Consulted.* I agree entirely with Gro. who observes, on this place, "*βουλευεσθαι* non "est hic consultare, sed constituere, ut Act. v. 33. xv. 37. 2 Cor. "i. 17." It is translated by Beau. *avoient resolu*, which is literally rendered by the Eng. An. *had resolved.* Indeed, such a design on the life of a man whom they do not seem to have charged with any guilt, might appear improbable; but the maxim of Caiaphas above explained, ch. xi. 49. [2] N. would serve, with judges disposed as those priests then were, to justify this murder also.

11. *Many Jews forsook them, and believed on Jesus, πολλοι υπηγον των Ιουδαιων και επιστευον εις τον Ιησουν.* E. T. *Many of the Jews went away, and believed on Jesus.* This interpretation is rather feeble. The Eng. word *went*, and even the words *went away*, before the mention of something done, are often little more than expletives. Here the word *υπηγον* bears a very important sense, and denotes their ceasing to pay that regard to the teaching of the scribes which they had formerly done. This is

universally acknowledged to be the meaning of the verb in this passage. Bishop Pearce, however, has gone too far, in the opposite extreme, from our translators, where he says, "*withdrew themselves*, i. e. from the public service in the synagogues." The ideas formed from the practice of modern sectaries have led him, in this instance, into a mistake. No sect of the Jews withdrew from the synagogue. Jesus, far from withdrawing, or encouraging his disciples to withdraw, attended the service in the temple at Jerusalem, and in the synagogue, wherever he happened to be. He promoted the same disposition in his disciples, by precept as well as by example, and particularly warned them against disregarding the ministry, on account of the vices of the minister. Mt. xxiii. 1, &c. The same conduct was observed by his Apostles and disciples after him. He foretold them, that they would be expelled the synagogue, ch. xvi. 2. but never gave them permission to leave it, whilst they were allowed by the Jewish rulers to attend it. The book of Acts shows, that they did in fact attend the synagogue every Sabbath, where there was a synagogue to which they had access. Diss. IX. P. IV. § 6.

13. *Israel's King.* Though we find in the common copies, ὁ βασιλευς του Ισραηλ, the article ὁ is wanting in so great a number of MSS. and editions, as to give just ground for rejecting it. For which reason, though the difference is of little moment, I have made use of this expression. Ch. x. 36. [2] N.

16. *After Jesus was glorified;* that is, after his resurrection and ascension.

17. *That he called Lazarus*—ὁτι τον Λαζαρον εφωνησεν—Vul. *Quando Lazarum vocavit.* So many MSS. read ὁτε for ὁτι, and so many versions are conformable to this reading, that it is hardly possible to decide between them. The sense is good and apposite either way. But, in such cases, it is better to let things remain as they are.

19. *Ye have no influence*, ουκ ωφελειτε ουδεν. Vul. *Nihil proficimus*, from the reading ωφελουμεν, which has hardly any support from MSS. or versions.

26. *If any man serve me, my Father will reward him*, εαν τις εμοι διακονη, τιμησει αυτον ὁ πατηρ. E. T. *If any man serve me, him my father will honour.* The word τιμη, in Scripture, sig-

nifies not only *honour*, but *reward*, price, wages. The verb τιμαω admits the same latitude of signification. Beau. though he renders the word, in his version, in the common way, *le honorera*, says, in his note upon it, "autrement *le recompensera*." Nay, he adds in effect, that it ought to be thus rendered here, as it is opposed to *serving*. "Comme *honorer* est ici opposé à *servir*, "il signifie proprement *recompenser*, ainsi qu'en plusieurs autres "endroits de l'ecriture."

27. *What shall I say ?* [*Shall I say*] *Father, save me from this hour ? But I came on purpose for this hour*— Τι ειπω ; πατερ, σωσον με εκ της ωρας ταυτης, αλλα δια τουτο ηλθον εις την ωραν ταυτην. E. T. *What shall I say ? Father, save me from this hour : but for this cause came I unto this hour.* I understand the question here, as ending, not at ειπω, but at ταυτης, at which there should be a point of interrogation ; or, rather that the words should be considered as two questions, in the manner done in this version. A similar example we have in the preceding chapter, verse 56th; for, in both, a part of the first question is understood as repeated. There τι δοκει υμιν ; δοκει ὁτι ου μη ελθη—— ; Here, τι ειπω; ειπω, πατηρ σωσον με——; I do not approve, with Markland (Bowyer's Conjectures), that τι should be rendered *whether*, and the question made, "Whether shall I say, Father, save me?—— "or, Father, glorify thy name?" If these could be supposed to occur to the mind at once, there could not be a moment's hesitation about the preference. It suits much better the distress of his soul, to suggest, at first, a petition for deliverance. But in this he is instantly checked by the reflection on the end of his coming. This determines him to cry out, "Father, glorify thy name." This is not put as a question. It is what his mind finally and fully acquiesces in.

28. *Thy name*, σου το ονομα. For το ονομα, four MSS. not of the highest account, read τον υἱον. Such also is the reading of the Cop. Eth. and Ara. versions. The second Sy. has it in the margin.

32. *All men*—παντας—. Vul. *Omnia*—. Agreeably to this, the Go. and the Sax. versions translate. The Cam. and one other MS. read παντα.

34. *From the law ;* that is, from the Scriptures. Ch. x. 34. N.

36. *He withdrew himself privately from them*, απελθων εκρυ-

βη απ' αυτων. E. T. *Departed and did hide himself from them.* This, in my apprehension, conveys a sense different from that of the original, which denotes simply, that in retiring, he took care not to be observed by them. The Sy. version is very close, and appears to me to imply no more. The Vul. which says, *abiit et abscondit se ab eis*, seems to have misled most of the modern interpreters. Cas. has hit the meaning better. *Discessit et eis sese subduxit.*

40. *Blunted their understanding, πεπωρωκεν την αυτων καρδιαν.* Diss. IV. § 22, 23, 24.

42. *Several, πολλοι.* E. T. *Many.* The Gr. word is of greater latitude than the Eng. and answers more exactly to the Fr. *plusieurs*, which, by translators from that language, is sometimes rendered *many*, sometimes *several*, as suits best the subject. Here, as it is only the minority of those in the highest offices that are spoken of, a minority greatly outnumbered by the opposite party, they can hardly be supposed very numerous.

44. *He who believeth on me, it is not on me he believeth;* that is, *not only on me.* The expression is similar to that in Mr. ix. 37. *Whosoever shall receive me, receiveth not me.* Both are explained in the same manner.

47. *But do not observe them, και μη πιστευση.* A considerable number of MSS. amongst which are the Al. and the Cam. read *φυλαξη*; to which agree not only the Vul. which says, *et non custodierit*, but both the Sy. Cop. Arm. Eth. Ara. and Sax. versions. together with the paraphrase of Nonnus:

Και μη ασυλητοιο νοου σφριγιδα φυλαξη.

49. *What I should enjoin, and what I should teach, τι ειπω και τι λαλησω.* E. T. *What I should say, and what I should speak.* These phrases convey to us no conceivable difference of meaning. If no difference of signification had been intended by the words of the original, the *τι* would not have been repeated before the second verb. The repetition evidently implies, that the subject of the one is not the subject of the other. *Ειπειν* frequently means *to command*, to enjoin, and *λαλειν to teach*, to instruct by discourse. When these are thus conjoined, as things related, but not synonymous, they serve to ascertain the meaning of each other; the former regarding the precepts of his religion, the latter its principles.

CHAPTER XIII.

2. *While they were at supper*, *δειπνου γενομενου*. E. T. *Supper being ended.* Vul. Er. Zu. *Cœna factâ.* Be. *Peractâ.* Cas. *Paratâ.* The two first ways of rendering the words in La. express too much; the last, too little. That supper was *ended*, is inconsistent with what follows in the chapter; and if it was only *prepared*, it would not have been said, verse 4th, *he arose from supper.* Maldonat's solution hardly requires refutation. He affirms, that our Lord that night ate three suppers with his disciples; the paschal supper, their ordinary supper, and the eucharistical supper; if this last might be called a supper. Hence, we find them still eating together, after we had been told, that *supper was ended.* In defence of the way wherein the words are rendered in the Vul. he argues thus: The Evangelist says, not *δειπνου γινομενου*, *cum cœna fieret*, using the present participle, but *γενομενου*, *cum cœna jam facta esset*, using the participle of the aorist. To this, it sufficeth to reply, that the sacred writers use the participle *γενομενου* indiscriminately, for both purposes, but much oftener to express the present, or rather the imperfect, than the past. Thus, when *γενομενης* is joined with *πρωιας*, *οψιας ἡμερας*, or any term denoting a precise portion of time, it invariably signifies that the period denoted by the noun was begun, not ended. Mr. says, vi. 2. *γενομενου σαββατου ηρξατο εν τη συναγωγη διδασκειν.* I should be glad to know of a single interpreter who renders these words—*When Sabbath was ended, he taught in the synagogue.* The words *sabbato facto*, in the Vul. denote no more here, in the judgment of all expositors, than *when Sabbath was come.* Our Lord says, Mt. xiii. 21. *γενομενης θλιψεως δια τον λογον, ευθυς σκανδαλιζεται.* Is it whilst the persecution rages, or when it is over, that men are tempted by it to apostatize? I shall add but one other example, from Mt. xxvi. 6, &c. *ιησου γενομενου εν Βηθανια εν οικια Σιμωνος προσηλθεν αυτῳ γυνη. κ. τ. ἑ.* Was it after Jesus had been in Simon's house in Bethany, that the woman anointed him with the precious balsam, or when he was there? The Vul. says expressly, *cum Jesus esset in domo Simonis.* I should not have brought so many examples in so clear a case, were it not to

demonstrate, what even critics can forget, how unsafe it is to depend on general rules, without recurring to use, wherever the recourse is practicable.

4. *Mantle, ἱματια.* E. T. *Garments.* Ἱματιον properly signifies *the upper garment, the mantle;* and ἱματια, *garments*, or *clothes* in general. Diss. VIII. P. III. § 1, 2, 3. Yet the plural is sometimes used for the singular, and means no more than *mantle*, as Mt. xxiv. 18. xxvi. 65. xxvii. 35. ch. xix. 23.

10. *He who hath been bathing, needeth only to wash his feet, ὁ λελουμενος ου χρειαν εχει η τους ποδας νιψασθαι.* For the distinction between λουειν and νιπτεσθαι, see ch. ix. 7. N. This illustration is borrowed from the custom of the times; according to which, those who had been invited to a feast, bathed themselves before they went; but, as they walked commonly in sandals, (unless when on a journey), and wore no stockings, it was usual to get their feet washed by the servants of the family, before they laid themselves on the couches. Their feet, which would be soiled by walking, required cleaning, though the rest of their body did not. The great utility, and frequent need, of washing the feet in those countries, has occasioned its being so often mentioned in the N. T. as an evidence of humility, hospitality, and brotherly love.

13. *Ye call me The teacher and The master,* Ὑμεις φωνειτε με Ὁ διδασκαλος και Ὁ κυριος. E. T. *Ye call me master and lord.* The article in Gr. prefixed to each appellation, and the nominative case employed where, in common language, it would have been the accusative, give great energy to the expression, and show, that the words are applied to Jesus in a sense entirely peculiar. This is not at all expressed by the words, *ye call me master and lord*, as though it had been φωνειτε με διδασκαλον και κυριον; for so common civility might have led them to call fifty others. But the titles here given, can belong only to one. This remark extends equally to the following verse. For the import of the titles, see Diss. VII.

23. *Was lying close to his breast.* Diss. VIII. P. III. § 3—6.

33. *My children, τεκνια.* E. T. *Little children.* Diminutives answer a double purpose. They express either the *littleness* or

fewness, in respect of size and number, of that to which they are applied, or the *affection* of the speaker. Diss. XII. P. I. § 19. There can be no doubt, that it is for the last of these purposes that the diminutive is used here. In Gr. when the first is only, or chiefly, intended, the word answering to little children is παιδια, or παιδαρια, not τεκνια. With us, the possessive pronoun answers better the purpose of expressing tenderness, for we have few diminutives.

34. *A new commandment.* In popular language, to which the manner of the sacred writers is very much adapted, that may be called a new law which revives an old law that had been in a manner abrogated by universal disuse. Our Lord, by this, warns his disciples against taking for their model, any example of affection wherewith the age could furnish them; or, indeed, any example less than the love which he all along, but especially in his death, manifested for them.

CHAPTER XIV.

1. *Believe on God, and believe on me*, πιστευετε εις τον Θεον, και εις εμε πιστευετε. E. T. *Ye believe in God, believe also in me.* The Gr. expression is ambiguous, and is capable of being rendered different ways. The Vul. which has had great influence on the translators in the West, has preferred the latter method, *creditis in Deum et in me credite;* and, in respect of the sense, is followed by Er. Zu. Cas. and Be. The Sy. has, on the contrary, preferred the former, which seems to be more generally adopted in the East. It was so understood also by Nonnus, who thus expresses the sense: Αλλα Θεῳ και εμοι πιστευσατε. This is the sense which the Gr. commentators also put upon the word; and, in this way, Luther interprets them. They are so rendered into Eng. by Dod. Wes. and Wor. The reasons of the preference I have given to this manner, are the following: 1st, In a point which depends entirely on the Gr. idiom, great deference is due to the judgment of those whose native language was Gr. The consent of Gr. commentators, in a question of this kind, is, therefore, of great weight. 2dly, The two clauses are so similarly expressed and linked together by the copulative, that it is, I suspect, unprecedented to make the verb, in one an indicative, and the same verb, repeated in the other, an imperative. The simple and natural way is, to render similarly what is similarly ex-

pressed; nor ought this rule ever to be departed from, unless something absurd or incongruous should follow from the observance of it. This is so far from being the case here, that I remark, 3dly, That, by rendering both in the imperative, the sense is not only good, but apposite. How frequently, in the book of Psalms, are the people of God, in the time of affliction, exhorted to trust in the Lord? Such exhortations, therefore, are not understood to imply a total want of faith in those to whom they are given.

2. *I go to prepare a place for you*, πορευομαι ἑτοιμασαι τοπον ὑμιν. Vul. *Quia vado parare vobis locum.* The Al. Cam. and several other MSS. do, in like manner, introduce the clause with ὁτι. The Arm. version also agrees with the Vul. So does the Sax. Nonnus likewise uses this conjunction—ὁτι προκελευθος ὁδευσω. But the evidence in favour of the common reading greatly preponderates.

11. *Believe*, πιστευετε μοι. Vul. *Non creditis.* This interpretation has doubtless arisen from a different reading. For the negative particle, there is no testimony in confirmation of the Vul. except the Sax. version. The Sy. has not read μοι, nor is it necessary to the sense. I have expressed the import of this pronoun, in interpreting the next clause— ει δε μη, *if not on my testimony.*

12, 13. *Nay, even greater than these he shall do, because I go to my Father, and will do whatsoever ye shall ask in my name*—και μειζονα τουτων ποιησει· ὁτι εγω προς τον πατερα μου πορευομαι, και ὁ, τι αν αιτησητε εν τῳ ονοματι μου, τουτο ποιησω. E. T. *And greater works than these shall he do, because I go unto my Father. And whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do.* This rendering is deficient both in perspicuity and in connection. Yet, except in the pointing, I have made no change on the words of the Evangelist. Our Lord's going to his Father, considered by itself, does not account for their doing greater works than he had done; but when that is considered, along with what immediately follows, that he will then do for them whatever they shall ask, it accounts for it entirely. When the 12th verse is made, as in the Eng. translation, a separate sentence, there is little connection, as well as light, in the whole passage. The propriety of reading the words in the manner I have done, has been justly observed by Gro. and others.

13, 14. *That the Father may be glorified in the Son, whatsoever*

ye shall ask in my name, I will do—ινα δοξασθη ὁ πατηρ εν τῳ υἱῳ. εαν τι αιτησητε εν τῳ ονοματι μου, εγω ποιησω. E. T. *That the Father may be glorified in the Son. If ye shall ask any thing in my name, I will do it.* The latter part of the 13th verse, I have detached from the preceding sentence, and joined into one sentence with the 14th verse. This preserves better the simplicity of construction in the sacred writings, and accounts for the repetition in verse 14th, of what had been said immediately before, almost in the same words.

14. *Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, I will do, εαν τι αιτησητε εν τῳ ονοματι μου, εγω ποιησω.* Vul. *Si quid petieritis me in nomine meo, hoc faciam.* The blunder in transcribing seems here pretty evident; yet it has the support of a few MSS. not of principal account, and of the Go. and Sax. versions.

16. *Monitor, παρακλητον.* E. T. *Comforter.* In the interpretation of this word, critics have been much divided. It is used by no other sacred writer; neither does it occur in the Sep. John uses it in four places of his Gospel, all in reference to the same person, and once in his first Epistle, as shall be observed immediately. The Sy. Vul. and some other ancient versions, retain the original term. Most modern interpreters have thought it better to translate it. Er. sometimes retains the word, and sometimes renders it *consolator;* so does also Leo de Juda. Cas. says *confirmator*, Be. *advocatus.* Under the first or last of these, all the translations into European tongues with which I am acquainted, may be ranged. Lu. Dio. G. F. Beau. P. R. Sa. and all the late Eng. versions but one follow Er. The An. follows Be. Si. though he does not render the word *avocat*, but *defenseur*, may be added; as he shows, in the notes, that he means by *defenseur*, what other interpreters meant by *avocat;* and for the same reason L. Cl. who also renders the word *defenseur.* Ham. has well observed on the passage, that the word is susceptible of these three significations, *advocate*, *exhorter*, and *comforter.* If, instead of *exhorter*, he had said *monitor*, I should readily admit that these three terms comprehend all that is ever implied in the original word. But the word *exhorter* is of very limited import, barely denoting one who by argument incites another to perform something to which he is reluctant; for *exhortation* always pre-supposes some degree of *reluctance* in the person *exhorted*, without

which it would be unnecessary. The term *monitor* includes what is most essential in the import of *exhorter*, as well as that of *remembrancer* and *instructer*, and comes nearer in extent than any one word, in our language, to the original term. I own that the word in classical authors more commonly answers to the La. *advocatus*. But the Eng. word *advocate* is more confined, and means one who, in the absence of his client, is instructed to plead his cause before his judge, and to defend him against his accuser. In this sense our Lord is called παράκλητος, 1 J. ii. 1. which is in the E. T. properly rendered *advocate*. *If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous.* We have one who, in our absence, appears for us, and defends our cause, before our judge. The notion of an *advocate* brings, along with it, the notion of a *judge* who is to pass sentence, and of a *client* who is to be defended. But, if any regard is due to the scope of the place, the word *advocate* is very improperly introduced, in the passage under examination, where there is nothing that suggests the idea of judge, cause, or party. *The advocate* exercises his office in presence of *the judge*. Whether *the client* be there or not, is of no consequence, as he is represented by his *advocate*. Now this παράκλητος, who, we are told, verse 26th, is *The Holy Spirit*, was to be sent to the disciples of Jesus, to remain with them for ever. If the word here then denote *advocate*, and if the Holy Spirit be that *advocate*, are the disciples, to whom he is sent, *the judges?* If not, who is *the judge?* what is the cause to be pleaded? and who are the parties? This interpretation introduces nothing but confusion and darkness. The only plea in its favour, which has any thing specious in it, is that, by the wisdom and eloquence with which the Spirit endowed the Apostles, and first Christian preachers, he powerfully defended the cause of Christ before the world: but as those first teachers themselves were made the instruments or immediate agents of the victory obtained to the Christian cause, over the infidelity of both Jews and Pagans, the Holy Spirit was to them much more properly a *monitor* or *prompter*, than an *advocate*. He did not appear openly to the world, which, as our Lord says, verse 17. *neither seeth him nor knoweth him;* but, by his secret instructions, they were qualified to plead with success the cause of Christianity. Let it be observed further, that our Lord says, that when he himself is gone, his Father will

send them *another* παρακλητος, who will remain with them for ever. From this we learn, 1st. That our Lord himself, when he was with them, had discharged that office among them; and, 2dly, That it was to supply his place in the discharge of the same function, that the Holy Spirit was to be sent. Now when our Lord is said, since his ascension into heaven, to be our *advocate* and *intercessor* with the Father, we perceive the beauty and energy, as well as the propriety of the representation. But we should never think of the title *advocate* for expressing the functions he discharged to his disciples when he sojourned among them upon the earth. We should readily say that to them he acted the part of a tutor, a father, a monitor, a guide, a comforter; but nobody would say that he acted to them as an advocate. I have been the more particular here for the sake of showing that it is not without reason, that Be. has in this been so generally deserted, even by those Protestant interpreters who, on other occasions, have paid but too implicit a deference to his judgment. Is *comforter* then the proper term? *Comforter*, I admit, is preferable. But this appellation is far from reaching the import of the original. Our Saviour, when there was occasion, as at this time in particular, acted the part of a *comforter* to his disciples. But this part is, in its nature, merely occasional, for a time of affliction; whereas that of *monitor*, *instructer* or *guide*, is, to imperfect creatures like us, always needful and important. Were we, in one word, to express the part acted by our Lord to his followers, we should certainly adopt any of the three last expressions rather than the first. Or if we consider what is here ascribed to the Spirit, as the part he is to act among the disciples, it will lead us to the same interpretation. *The Holy Spirit*, says our Lord, verse 26. *whom the Father will send in my name; he will teach you all things, and remind you of all that I have told you.* Is not this to say, in other words, "He will be to you a faithful monitor?" Further, the conjugates of the word παρακλητος entirely suit this interpretation. The general import of παρακαλειν, in the active voice, is to *admonish*, to exhort, to entreat, and παρακλησις, *admonition*, exhortation. It is manifest, as has been justly remarked by Dr. Ham. that in some places the import of the noun has been unduly limited, by being rendered *comfort* or consolation; particularly that παρακλησις, του αγιου πνευματος, Acts ix. 31. is much more properly rendered *the admonition*, than *the comfort of the Holy Spirit.* Diss. VIII. P. III. § 8.

[2] It is perhaps hardly worth remarking, that the Mahometans pretend that the coming of their prophet is here predicted. The evangelist, say they, did not write παρακλητος *paracletos*, but περικλυτος *periclytos*, that is *illustrious*, which is the import of the name *Mahomet* in Arabic. But whence had they this information? The Gospel of John was well known throughout the church, for several centuries before the appearance of Mahomet; whereas the reading alleged by them, had never before been heard of; nor has it been discovered ever since in any one MS. ancient translation, commentary, or ecclesiastical writing of any kind.

18. *I will not leave you orphans*, ουκ αφησω υμας ορφανους. E. T. *I will not leave you comfortless.* I cannot imagine what could have led our translators into the singularity of deserting the common road, where it is so patent; unless, by introducing *comfortless*, they have thought that they gave some support to their rendering the word παρακλητος in the context, *comforter.*

19. *Because I shall live;* that is, return to life. A great part of this discourse must have been dark at the time it was spoken; but the event explained it afterwards.

22. *Wherefore wilt thou discover thyself to us?* τι γεγονεν οτι ημιν μελλεις εμφανιζειν σεαυτον. E. T. *How is it that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us?* The expression *How is it that* is ambiguous, and may be an inquiry about the manner of his discovering himself to them. The words of the Evangelist can be interpreted only as an inquiry into the reason of his discovering himself to them and not to the world. This question arose from the remains of national prejudices in regard to the Messiah, to which the Apostles themselves were not, till after the descent of the Spirit, related in the 2d chapter of the Acts, entirely superior. Our Lord's answer, in the two following verses, though, in all probability, not perfectly understood by them at the time, assigns a reason for the distinction he would make between his disciples and the world, but says nothing about the manner of discovering himself.

24. *Is not mine, but the Father's;* that is (setting aside the idiom), is not so much mine as the Father's. Mt. ix. 13. Mr. ix. 37.

28. *Ye would rejoice that I go to the Father*, εχαρητε αν ὁτι ειπον, πορευομαι προς τον πατερα. E. T. *Ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father.* The word ειπον is not in the Al. MS. nor in the Cam. It is wanting also in several others. There is nothing which answers to it in either of the Sy. versions, or in the Vul. Goth. Sax. Cop. Arm. Eth. or Ara. Origen, Cyril, Chr. seem not to have read it. The same may be affirmed of Nonnus the paraphrast. Such a concurrence of all the most ancient and most eminent translations, supported by some of the best MSS. and Grecian critics, have induced me to join with Mill and Bengelius in rejecting it.

30. *The prince of the world*, ὁ του κοσμου τουτου αρχων. E. T. *The prince of this world.* There is such a powerful concurrence of MSS. both those of principal note and others, with both the Sy. versions, some of the most celebrated Gr. commentators, together with Nonnus, in rejecting the pronoun τουτου, that not only Mill, but Wet. who is much more scrupulous, is for excluding it.

[2] *He will find nothing in me*, εν εμοι ουκ εχει ουδεν. E. T. *Hath nothing in me.* Though not so great as in either of the instances immediately preceding, there is considerable authority from MSS. versions, and ancient authors, for reading either ευρισκει or ευρησει, instead of ουκ εχει. For this reason, and because it makes the expression clearer, I think, with Mill, it ought to be admitted.

CHAPTER XV.

2. *He cleaneth by pruning*, καθαιρει. E. T. *He purgeth.* Critics have observed a verbal allusion or paronomasia in this verse. To the barren branch the word αιρει is applied; to the fruitful, καθαρει. It is not always possible in a version, to preserve figures which depend entirely on the sound, or on the etymology of the words, though sometimes they are not without emphasis. This verse and the following, afford another, and more remarkable, instance of the same trope. As our Lord himself is here represented by the vine; his disciples are represented by the branches. The mention of the method which the dresser takes with the fruitful branches, in order to render them

more fruitful, and which he expresses by the word καθαιρει, leads him to take notice of the state wherein the Apostles, the principal branches, were at that time, Ηδη υμεις καθαροι εστε. It is hardly possible not to consider the καθαιρει applied to the branches as giving occasion to this remark, which immediately follows it. Now when the train of the thoughts arises in any degree from verbal allusions, it is of some consequence to preserve them, where it can be easily effected, in a translation. It is for this reason that I have translated the word καθαιρει by a circumlocution, and said *cleaneth by pruning*. It is evident that καθαιρει, in this application, means *pruneth*. But to say in Eng. simply *pruneth*, would be to throw away the allusion, and make the thoughts appear more abrupt in the version than they do in the original; and to say *cleaneth*, without adding any explanation, would be obscure, or rather improper. The word used in the E. T. does not preserve the allusion, and is, besides, in this application, antiquated. Nonnus appears to have been careful to preserve the trope; for though almost all the other words in the two verses are changed, for the sake of the measure, he has retained καθαιρειν and καθαροι. Few translators appear to have attended to this allusion: yet whatever strengthens the association in the sentences, serves to make them both better understood, and longer remembered.

6. *Like the withered branches which are gathered for fuel, and burnt*, ως το κλημα, και εξηρανθη, και συναγουσιν αυτα, και εις πυρ βαλλουσι, και καιεται. E. T. *As a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned.* Through an excessive desire of tracing the letter, a plain sentiment is here rendered indistinctly and obscurely. Knatchbull's observation is just. In the idiom of the sacred writers, the copulative often supplies the place of the relative, *a branch, and is withered*, for *a branch which is withered*, or *a withered branch*. See Ruth i. 11. Many other examples might be brought from Scripture. The singular number is sometimes used collectively, as *branch* for *branches*. This may account for αυτα in the plural. Some MSS. indeed, and even some versions read αυτο: but the difference does not affect the sense.

8. *So shall ye be my disciples*, και γενησεσθε εμοι μαθηται. The Cam. and several other MSS. have γενησθε for γενησεσθε, Agree-

ably to which the Vul. says *et efficiamini mei discipuli.* With this also agree the Cop. and Sax. versions.

10. *Ye shall continue in my love*, μενειτε εν τη αγαπη μου. Dod. and Wor. *Ye will continue in my love.* The precept *continue in my love*, in the preceding verse, which must determine the meaning of this declaration, is capable of being understood in two ways, as denoting either *continue to love me*, or *continue to be loved by me;* in other words, 'keep your place in my affection.' In my opinion the latter is the sense, and therefore I have retained the old manner *ye shall* in preference to *ye will*, as the former is frequently the sign of a promise, which I take the sentence to contain to this effect: *If ye keep my commandments, ye shall continue the objects of my love.* For this preference, it is proper to assign my reasons: First, it is most natural to suppose, that when our Lord enjoined them to continue in a particular state, it would be in that state wherein he had signified that they then were. Now this state is manifestly that of being loved by him; of which mention is made in the words immediately preceding. *As the Father loveth me*, says he, *so I love you; continue in my love.* 'Ye possess my love at present, continue to possess it.' But here a doubting might arise in their minds, 'How shall we 'continue to possess it? or how shall we know that we con-'tinue to possess it?' To obviate all such exceptions, he adds, 'If ye keep my commandments, ye shall continue to possess my 'love; as I have kept my Father's commandments, and continue 'to possess his love.' In the other way explained, besides that the connection is loose, the passage is not so significant. 'If ye 'keep my commandments, ye will continue to love me.' Better, one would think, 'If ye continue to love me, ye will keep my 'commandments:' since that is regarded as the cause, this as the effect. Accordingly a good deal is said to this purpose afterwards.

11. *That I may continue to have joy in you*, ινα η χαρα η εμη εν υμιν μεινη. E. T. *That my joy might remain in you.* It is to be observed, that εν υμιν is placed betwixt η χαρα η εμη, and μεινη. I render it as immediately connected with the words preceding, our translators have rendered it as belonging to the word which follows. The former makes a clear and apposite sense, the latter is obscure, not to say mysterious.

16. *It is not you, ουχ υμεις.* Diss. XII. P. I. § 32.

2 *That the Father may give you whatsoever ye shall ask him in my name, ινα ὁ τι αν αιτησητε τον πατερα εν τῳ ονοματι μου, δῳ υμιν.* It is an obvious remark, that *δῳ* is equivocal, as it applies equally to the first person and to the third. Explained in the first person, it runs thus: *that I may give you whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name.* Nonnus explains the words so in his Paraphrase; but the Vul. the Sy. and indeed the whole current of interpreters, have understood the verb as in the third person. This interpretation is also best suited to the scope of the place. I have, therefore, with the other Eng. translators, adopted it here.

18. *It hated me before it hated you, εμε πρωτον υμων μεμισηκεν.* Vul. *Me priorem vobis odio habuit.* The other La. interpreters, if not in the same words, are to the same purpose. So are also the Sy. and other Oriental translations. The M. G. and all the other versions I know, before the present century, express the same sense. Nonnus has so understood the words, who says *πρωτον εμε στυγεεσκε.* For, as he has not prefixed the article, and has suppressed the pronoun, his words cannot be otherwise rendered than *it hated me first.* Unless my memory fails me, I may affirm the same thing of ancient commentators as of interpreters. This uniformity of interpretation, where the subject is nowise abstruse, is a strong presumption in its favour. Our Lord was not discussing any sublime question of theology, but giving plain admonitions to patience and constancy, which, it would be strange to imagine, had been so expressed by the Evangelist, as to be universally misunderstood by those expositors who spoke the same language, who lived, I may say, in the neighbourhood, not long after those events; and to be at last discovered in the eighteenth century, by those who, comparatively, are strangers both to the dialect, and to the manners, of the age and country. Yet Dr. Lardner, a very respectable name, I acknowledge, is the first who has defended a different meaning, a meaning which had indeed been hinted, but not adopted, by Be. more than a century before. Lardner supposes *πρωτον* here to be neither adjective nor adverb, but a substantive, of which the proper interpretation is *prince* or *chief.* It is freely owned that the sense which results from this rendering is both good and apposite, yet not more so than the common version. Nothing serves more strongly

to fortify the soul with patience under affliction, than the remembrance of what those whom we esteem, underwent before us. *Πρωτος*, as was formerly observed, (ch. i. 15. [3] N.) is often used substantively for *chief;* that is, first, not in time, but in excellence, rank, or dignity. Some examples of this use were given. But it ought to be remembered, that *πρωτος*, in this application, when it has a regimen, preserves the construction of an adjective in the superlative degree. It is commonly preceded by the article, and is always followed, either by the genitive plural of the noun expressing the subject of comparison, or, if the noun be a collective, by the genitive singular. In like manner, the noun governed includes both the thing compared, and the things to which it is compared. Thus, to say *ὁ πρωτος εστιν ὑμων he is the chief of you*, implies he is one of you; *οἱ πρωτοι της Γαλιλαιας* can be applied to none but Galileans, and *οἱ πρωτοι των Ιουδαιων*, to none but Jews. He who is called (Acts, xxviii. 7.) *ὁ πρωτος της νησου*, must have been one of the islanders. If then, our Lord had said *εμε τον πρωτον ἡμων μεμισηκεν*, I should admit the interpretation to be plausible, as the construction is regular, and he himself is included in the *ἡμων*; but the words which the Evangelist represents him as having used, no more express this in Gr. than the words *Jesus was the greatest of the apostles*, would express in Eng. that he was no apostle, but the Lord and Master of the apostles. When Paul calls himself (1 Tim. i. 15.) *πρωτος ἁμαρτωλων chief of sinners*, is he not understood by every body as calling himself a sinner? *The chief of the Levites* (Num. iii. 32.) was certainly a Levite, and *the chief of the singers* (Neh. xii. 46.) was a *singer*. But are there no exceptions from this rule? I acknowledge that there is hardly a rule in grammar which is not, through negligence, sometimes transgressed, even by good writers: and if any think that such oversights are to be deemed exceptions, I will not dispute about the word. Only, in regard to such exceptions, it will be admitted a good rule for the expounder, never to suppose a violation of syntax, when the words, construed in a different manner, appear regular, and yield an apposite meaning. This I take to be the case in the present instance. That there are examples of such inaccuracy in the use of superlatives, perhaps in all languages, can hardly be denied. Of this I take that quoted from 2 Mac. vii. 41. to be a flagrant example;

εσχατη των υἱων ἡ μητηρ ετελευτησε, which is literally, *the mother died last of the sons.* This is of a piece with that of our poet:

> Adam the comeliest man of men since born
> His sons, the fairest of her daughters Eve.

For my part, I think it much better, in criticising, to acknowledge these to be slips in writing, than to account for them by such supposed enallages, and unnatural ellipses as totally subvert the authority of Syntax, and leave every thing in language vague and indeterminate. The ellipsis of a preposition suggested in the present case is merely hypothetical; for no examples are produced to show, either that *πρωτος* has the meaning ascribed to it, when accompanied with any of the prepositions *εξ*, *προ*, *περι*, or *επι*, supposed to have been dropped; or that it has the meaning without a preposition, when the supposed ellipsis takes place. Yet both of these, especially the latter, appear to be necessary for removing doubt. The only thing that looks like an example of the superlative *πρωτος*, with an exclusive regimen, is that expression Mt. xxvi. 17. *τη πρωτη των αζυμων*, spoken of the day of the passover, which was the fourteenth of the month; though in strictness, the fifteenth was the first of the days of unleavened bread. But for this Dr. Lardner himself has sufficiently accounted, by showing that these two successive festivals, though distinct in themselves, are often, in the Jewish idiom, confounded as one, and that both by the sacred writers and by the historian Josephus. Let it be further observed, that in none of the three places where the phrase in question occurs (to wit, ch. i. 15. 30. and here) is *πρωτος* accompanied with the article which, for the most part, attends the superlative, especially when used for a title of distinction, and more especially still when, as in this place, the article is necessary to remove ambiguity; for *πρωτον* without it, is more properly an adverb, or adverbial preposition, than a noun. Add to all this, that *πρωτος* is not a title which we find any where else in the N. T. either assumed by our Lord, or given to him. This title is indeed in one place (Mt. x. 2.) given to Peter as first of the apostles. Of the propriety of this application there can be no doubt. The attentive reader will observe that the objections here offered against Lardner's interpretation of the clause under review, equally affect his interpretation of the clause *πρωτος μου ην*, ch. i. 15. 30.

20. *If they have observed my word, they will also observe yours,* *ει τον λογον μου ετηρησαν, και τον ὑμετερον τηρησουσιν.* E. T. *If they have kept my saying, they will keep yours also.* Several critics are of opinion, that the word *τηρειν* is used here in a bad sense for, to watch with an insidious design. But I do not find that the simple verb *τηρειν* ever occurs in this sense in Scripture, though the compound *παρατηρειν* is so used by both Mr. and L. It is also worthy of notice that the phrase *τηρειν τον λογον*, seems to be a favourite expression of the Evangelist John, and is every where else manifestly employed in a good sense: so that if this be an exception, it is the only one. What has been now remarked, makes much more in favour of the common translation, than what has been observed of the words immediately following in verse 21. which imply that all the treatment mentioned had been bad, makes against it: for let it be observed, that the connection is often founded, not on the form of the expression, but on what is suggested by it. Our Lord, by what he here says, recalls to their memories the neglect and contempt with which his doctrine had been treated, and in allusion to which he says, *All this treatment, &c.* I shall only add, that even admitting that there is some ambiguity in the Gr. verb *τηρειν*, it will not surely be thought greater than there is in the Eng. word *observe,* employed in this translation, and sometimes susceptible of an unfavourable meaning.

24. *But now they have seen them, and yet hate both me and my Father,* *νυν δε και ἑωρακασι, και μεμισηκασι, και εμε και τον πατερα μου.* E. T. *But now they have both seen and hated both me and my Father.* In order to give consistency to the argument which our Lord here uses, we are obliged to consider *αυτα* as understood after *ἑωρακασι.* All the foreign translations I have seen, whether from the Gr. or from the La. supply the pronoun in this place. Without it, the words convey a very different sense; a sense which is neither so apposite, nor so intelligible.

25. *In their law.* Ch. x. 34. N.

CHAPTER XVI.

2. *Nay the time is coming when—αλλ' ερχεται ωρα ινα.* E. T. *Yea the time cometh that* — Bishop Pearce would have us read *αλλ' ερχεται ωρα* in a parenthesis, and connect *ινα* with the words which precede, because he thinks that to render *ινα when* is scarcely to be justified. But he has not devised any correction, or taken any notice of verse 32. of the same chapter, where the like phrase occurs, *ερχεται ωρα και νυν εληλυθεν, ινα σκορπισθητε*, and where the *ινα*, to the conviction of all expositors, denotes *when*. This is a plain Hebraism; their causal conjunction כי *chi*, being sometimes used in this sense; an idiom more frequent in J. than in any other penman of the N. T. We have another example of it from him, if I mistake not, in his third Epistle, verse 4th. And this, by the way, is a presumption of the authenticity of that epistle.

2 *Will think he offereth sacrifice to God, δοξη λατρειαν προσφερειν τω Θεω.* E. T. *Will think he doth God service.* Our translators have here followed the Vul. which has *arbitretur obsequium se præstare Deo.* Er. Zu. Cas. and Be. have done better in substituting *cultum* for *obsequium*. The La. word *obsequium*, and the Eng. word *service*, are too general: *λατρεια* is properly the public service of religion, and when joined as in this place, with *προσφερειν*, can mean only *sacrifice*. It is so rendered in the Sy. version and the Go. Some adages of their rabbies regarding the assassination of the enemies of their religion, show how justly they are here represented by our Lord.

3. *These things they will do, ταυτα ποιησουσιν υμιν.* E. T. *These things they will do unto you.* But *υμιν* is wanting in many MSS. of principal note, as well as in others of less consideration, in the Com. edition, and in that of Ben. in the first Sy. version, the Go. the Sax. and the Ara.; also in some La. MSS. In the 2d Sy. version, it is marked with an asterisk, as of doubtful authority at the best. It seems not to have been admitted by Chr. Cyril, The. or Cyprian. For these reasons I agree with Mill and Wet. in rejecting it.

9. *Concerning sin;* that is, *their sin*, in rejecting me, whereof the Spirit will give incontestible evidence in the miracles which he will enable my Apostles to perform in my name, and the success with which he will crown their teaching.

10. *Concerning righteousness;* that is, *my righteousness* or innocence, the justice of my cause (Mt. xxvii. 24. N.) of which the same miraculous power exerted for me by my disciples, will be an irrefragable proof, convincing all the impartial, that I had the sanction of Heaven for what I did and taught, and that, in removing me hence, God hath taken me to himself.

11. *Concerning judgment;* that is, *divine judgment*, soon to be manifested in the punishment of an incredulous nation, and in defence of the truth.

13. *Into all the truth*, εις πασαν την αληθειαν. E. T. *into all truth.* The article ought not here to have been omitted. It is not omniscience, surely, that was promised, but all necessary religious knowledge. Yet Mr. Wesley's is the only Eng. version I have seen which retains the article.

16. *Within a little while.* Diss. XII. P. I. § 24.

25. *In figures*, εν παροιμιαις. E. T. *In proverbs.* Vul. *In proverbiis.* Er. and Zu. *Per proverbia.* Be. *Per similitudines.* Cas. *Oratione figurata.* Παροιμια is used by the Seventy in translating the Heb. משל *mashal*, which signifies not only a proverb, but whatever is expressed in figurative or poetical language, as their proverbs commonly were. Thus it is used, ch. x. 6. for a similitude, rendered in the E. T. *a parable.* Here it is manifestly used in all the latitude, implied in the expression employed by Castalio; that is, for figurative language, not intended to be understood by every body, and perhaps, for a time, not perfectly even by the Apostles themselves.

35. *That any should put questions to thee*, ινα τις σε ερωτᾳ. E. T. *That any man should ask thee.* There are two Gr. verbs not synonymous, used in this context, αιτειν and ερωταν, which are both rendered in the E. T. *ask.* The former answers always to the Eng. word, when it means *to beg*, to entreat; the latter generally, but not always, when it denotes *to put a question.*

As the Eng. verb *ask*, had been used in the former sense in verse 26. answering to *αιτεω*, I thought it better here to use a periphrasis, than to employ the same word for expressing the latter sense in rendering the verb *ερωταω*. Even the slightest appearance of ambiguity should be avoided in the translation, when there can be no doubt concerning the meaning of the original. The purport of the words, therefore, in this place, is, 'Thou knowest us 'so perfectly, and what all our doubts and difficulties are, as ren-'ders it unnecessary to apply to thee by questions. Our inten-'tions this way are anticipated by the instructions which thou art 'giving us from time to time.'

CHAPTER XVII.

2. *That he may bestow eternal life on all those whom thou hast given him*, *ινα παν ὁ δεδωκας αυτῳ, δωσῃ αυτοις ζωην αιωνιον.* The words seem capable of being rendered, *that he may give to them all that thou hast given to him, eternal life.* Though this rendering appear at first closer, the common version is in my opinion, preferable. *Παν ὁ* followed by the pronouns of the third person, in whatever case, number, or gender, is a Hebraism answering to בל אשר which may be either singular or plural, and may relate either to persons or things. The pronoun connected as מנו להם ascertains the import. Another example of this idiom we have ch. vi. 39. *Ἱνα παν ὁ δεδωκε μοι, μη απολεσω εξ αυτου.* A like idiom we find, 1 Pet. ii. 24. *ᾧ τῳ μωλωπι αυτου ιαθητε.* Though the Vul. which keeps close to the letter, *ut omne quod dedisti ei, det eis vitam æternam*, seems to favour the second interpretation, father Si. in translating the Vul. considers the Heb. idiom as here so incontrovertible, that, without assigning a reason, in his notes, he renders it *afin qu'il donne la vie éternelle à tous ceux que vous lui avez donnés ;* precisely as if the La. had been *ut omnibus illis quos dedisti ei, det vitam æternam.* There would be no propriety in translating the phrase here differently from what it has been always translated ch. vi. 39.

[2] *Thy apostle*, ch. x. 36. N.

3. *The Messiah.* Dis. V. P. IV. § 7.

5. *Father, glorify thou me in thine own presence*, *δοξασον με συ*

πατερ, παρα σεαυτῳ. E. T. *O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self.* This expression, though apparently more literal, is remarkably obscure. The force of the Gr. preposition παρα, is not rightly expressed by the Eng. *with*, which, as applied here, is exceedingly vague and indeterminate.

11. *Preserve them in thy name*, τηρησον αυτους εν τῳ ονοματι σου. E. T. *Keep through thine own name those*—. It must be acknowledged that there is some difficulty in the words εν τῳ ονοματι σου, which I have rendered literally *in thy name*. *Name* is used in Scripture sometimes for *person*, Rev. iii. 4.; sometimes for *fame*, Ps. lxxvi. 1.; and sometimes, when applied to God, for his *power*, or other perfections, Ps. xx. 1. 7. When mention is made of *making known God's name* to the heathen, we always understand it to mean, declaring to them his nature and attributes, as the only true God. It is solely *to the heathen*, or those who before knew not God, that, in the O. T. we find mention of revealing his name. But let it be observed, that they were Jews of whom our Lord spoke, verse 6th, when he said, *I have made known thy name to the men whom thou hast given me.* The sequel shows, that he meant the Apostles, who, before they became his disciples, were the disciples of Moses. Now, by making known the name of God to those who enjoyed the old dispensation, is plainly suggested, that additional light was conveyed to them, which they could not have derived from it. By manifesting God's name to them, therefore, we must understand the communication of those truths which peculiarly characterize the new dispensation. And as every revelation which God gives, tends further to illustrate the divine character, the instructions which our Lord gave to his disciples, relating to life and immortality, and the recovery of sinners through his mediation, may well be called revealing God, or (which in the Heb. idiom, is the same) *the name of God* to them. When the connection in this prayer is considered with any degree of attention, we must be sensible that the words, *the name of God*, in verses 6th, 11th, 12th, and 26th, denote the same thing. If, then, by *the name of God*, verses 6th and 26th, be meant the great foundations of the Christian institution, the being preserved or kept in it, verses 11th and 12th, must mean their being enabled to continue in the faith and practice of that religion. Our translators, by rendering εν τῳ ονοματι σου differently, in verses 11th and 12th, have darkened the ex-

pression, and led the generality of readers into mistakes. *Keep, through thine own name*, can hardly be understood otherwise than as signifying, preserve, by thy power. Similar expressions occur in the Psalms and other places. If verse 11th were the only place in this prayer where mention is made of *the name of God*, I should not deny that this interpretation would have some plausibility. But as that is not the case, we cannot interpret *εν τω ονοματι σου* one way in verse 11th, and another way in verse 12th, where it is similarly connected and construed. What is to be remarked in the subsequent note, serves in some degree, to confirm the interpretation now given. I own the Eng. word *name* hardly admits this latitude of acceptation. But it was observed (Diss. XII. P. V. § 12.), that we are obliged sometimes, in order to avoid tiresome circumlocutions, to admit an application of particular terms, which is not entirely warranted by use. When there is a difficulty (for it is only of such cases I am speaking,) there is this advantage in tracing the words of the original, that the sense of the sacred writer is not arbitrarily confined by the opinions of the translator, but is left in the text, as nearly as possible, in the same extent, to the judgment of the reader.

[2] *Which thou hast given me*, *ους δεδωκας μοι*. E. T. *Whom thou hast given me.* But there is a great majority of MSS. and, among them, those of principal consideration, which reject the word *ους* in this place. A few substitute *ὁ* in its room, but the much greater number have *ᾧ*. In either way, the meaning is the same with that given in this version. The relative in Gr. often takes the case of the antecedent, and not always, as in La. the case that is governed by the verb with which it is connected. For reading *ᾧ*, there is also the authority of the Com. both the Sy. translations, and the Ara. Of the fathers, there are Athanasius, Cyril, The. and Euth.; likewise many modern critics; amongst whom are, Ham. Mill, and Wet. Add to this, that such a mistake as the change of *ᾧ*, into *ους*, in this place, is easily accounted for: *ους δεκωκας μοι* occurs in the very next verse. It is incident to transcribers, either through inadvertency in directing their eye, or through suspicion of mistake in the former copier, to make expressions of the author, which are nearly the same, entirely so. Besides, the meaning of *ους δεδωκας* is more obvious than that of *ᾧ δεδωκας*, which might readily lead a transcriber to consider the latter as a mere blunder in copying. But if the

word was originally *ους*, it is not easily to be accounted for, that it should have been so generally corrected into *ῳ*, and the like correction on verses 6th and 12th not attempted. It may be observed in passing, that this reading does not a little confirm the sense I have given to the word *name*, through the whole of this passage. If, by the name here, be meant the Gospel revelation, nothing can be more conformable to the tenor of our Lord's whole discourse on this occasion; this revelation was given by the Father to his Son, to be by him communicated to the world.

[3] *That they may be one, as we are, ινα ωσιν εν, καθως ημεις.* The word is here *εν*, *one thing;* not *εις*, *one person.* Ch. x. 30. N.

13. *That their joy in me may be complete, ινα εχωσι την χαραν την εμην πεπληρωμενην εν αυτοις.* E. T. *That they might have my joy fulfilled in themselves.* What meaning our translators affixed to these words, I cannot say; but the whole scope and connection make it evident, that *η χαρα η εμη* denotes, here, not the joy which I have (the only sense which the words *my joy* will bear in Eng.) but the joy whereof I am the object, the joy they will derive from me. Beau. seems to have been the first modern interpreter who rendered the words intelligibly, *afin qu'ils goutent en moi une joie parfaite;* and the only one in Eng. the An.

17. *By the truth, εν τη αληθεια σου.* E. T. *Through thy truth.* The pronoun is not in some principal MSS. nor in the Vul. the Go. and the Sax. versions. Cyril seems not to have read it; and Ben. and Mill reject it. It is very unnecessary here, as the explanation subjoined, *thy word is the truth*, sufficiently appropriates it.

24. *Father, I would, πατερ, θελω.* E. T. *Father, I will. Θελω* expresses no more than a petition, a request. It was spoken by our Lord in prayer to his heavenly Father, to whom he was obedient, even unto death. But the words *I will*, in Eng. when *will* is not the sign of the future, express rather a command. The La. *volo*, though not so uniformly as the Eng. *I will*, admits the same interpretation; and, therefore, Beza's manner here, who renders the word used by John, *velim*, is much preferable to that of the Vul. Er. Zu. and Cas. who say, *volo.* That the sense of the Gr. word is, in the N. T. as I have represented it, the critical reader may soon satisfy himself, by consulting the following passages

in the original: Mt. xii. 38. xxvi. 39. Mr. vi. 25. x. 35. In some of these, the verb is rendered *would*, by our translators; it ought to have been rendered so in them all, as they all manifestly imply request, not command. In most of the late Eng. translations, this impropriety is corrected. Dod. and Wes. have, indeed, retained the words *I will;* nay, more, have made them the foundation of an argument (one in his Paraphrase, the other in his Notes), that what follows *I will*, is not so properly a petition, as a claim of right. But this argument is built on an Anglicism in their translations, for which the sacred author is not accountable. Augustine, in like manner, founding on a Latinism, argued from the word *volo* of the Itc. version, as a proof of the equality of the Father and the Son. He is very well answered by Be. whose sentiments on this subject, are beyond suspicion. See his note on the place. The sons of Zebedee also use the word θελομεν, Mr. x. 35. in making a request to Jesus; but it would be doing great injustice to the two disciples to say, either that they claimed, as their right, what they then asked, or that they called themselves equal to their lord and master. Calvin, speaking of those who, in support of the trinity of persons in the godhead, argued that Moses, in his account of the creation, joins *elohim* (a word signifying God), in the plural number, to the verb *bara* (created), in the singular, advises very properly, "Monendi sunt "lectores ut sibi a violentis ejusmodi glossis caveant" (Comment. in Gen. i. 1.). I shall conclude this note with the words of Cas. (Defensio, &c.): "Ego veritatem velim veris argumentis defendi, non ita ridiculis, quibus deridenda propinetur adversariis."

CHAPTER XVIII.

1. *Over the brook Kidron*, περαν του χειμαρρου των Κεδρων. E. T. *Over the brook Cedron*. The Al. MS. alone, reads του Κεδρων. The majority of modern critics agree with Jerom in thinking, that this, which suits the Vul. *trans torrentem Cedron*, is the genuine reading; a remarkable instance wherein the internal evidence is more than a counterbalance to numerous testimonies, or strong external evidence on the opposite side. *Kidron* is, in Heb.

the name of a brook near Jerusalem, of which mention is several times made in the historical books of the O. T. The name, when written in Gr. characters, coincides with the genitive plural of the appellative κεδρος, *a cedar*. The transcribers of the N. T. were (with very few, if any, exceptions) Greeks or Latins, who knew nothing of Heb. Such, finding the singular article του joined with the plural κεδρων, would naturally impute it to inadvertency, arising from hurry in transcribing. In consequence of this notion, του would readily be changed into των, by all who chose to have their copies clear from flagrant blunders. This so perfectly, and with so much natural probability, accounts for the change of του and των, both here, and in some places of the Sep. as, in my judgment, greatly preponderates all the MSS. and versions in the opposite scale. Most interpreters since Jerom's time, that is, since the introduction of the study of Oriental literature into the West, have thought so likewise. It may be remarked also, that this is one of the few passages in which the Eng. translators have preferred the reading of the Vul. though unsupported, to the almost universal reading of the Gr. the proper version of which is *the brook of Cedars*. My reason for saying *Kidron*, I have assigned above. Diss. XII. P. III. § 6, &c.

11. *Put up the sword*, Βαλε την μαχαιραν σου. E. T. *Put up thy sword*. But the pronoun is wanting in most of the MSS. of principal account, and a great many others. It is neither in the Com. edition, nor in that of Ben. It is not in either Sy. Go. Cop. or Arm. versions. Nonnus, who says simply, κολεω τε τιθει ξιφος, seems not to have read it. Will and Wet. reject it.

15. *And another disciple*, και ὁ αλλος μαθητης. This is another instance wherein our translators have preferred the reading of the Vul. to that of the common Gr. The Vul. says, *et alius discipulus*. The only authorities from MSS. for this reading, are the Al. the Cam. and another of less note ; all which omit the article. Wet. mentions no versions which favour it, except the Vul. and the Go. It is surprising that he does not mention the Sy. which expresses exactly the sense of the Vul. in this manner, *and one of the other disciples*. It was impossible in that language, which has no articles, to show more explicitly that, in their original, the expression was indefinite. The Sax. version also says *another*. This renders it very probable, that it was so in the Old

Itc. Nonnus too expresses it indefinitely, *και νεος αλλος εταιρος*. On the whole, however, if it were not for that evidence which results from connection, the scope of the place, and the ordinary laws of composition, I should not lay great stress on all that can be pleaded in its favour from positive testimony.

20. *Whither the Jews constantly resort*, *ὅπου παντοθεν οἱ Ἰουδαιοι συνερχονται*. E. T. *Whither the Jews always resort*. This is the third example in this chapter (so many will not be found in all the rest of the Gospel) wherein our translators, whom I have copied in these instances, have deserted the common Gr. Here, however, they have adopted a reading vouched by the plurality of MSS. though unsupported either by the Vul. or by the Sy. Beside MSS. the Com. and some other valuable editions, read *παντοτε*. This reading is favoured also by the Go. and second Sy. and by some of the Gr. fathers. *Παντες* is supported by the Al. and several other MSS. some early editions, with the Vul. 1st Sy. Cop. Arm. Sax. and Eth. versions. Be. in his edition, whence the common editions are derived, has put *παντοθεν*, giving his reason in the Notes, in these words: "in vetustis codicibus legimus *παντοτε*: "ego verò existimo, vel legendum *παντες*, vel *παντοθεν*, quod "facile potuit a librariis mutari in *παντοτε*." Wet. after these words which he quotes, subjoins, very properly, "et ita quidem, "quod mireris, contra omnes codices edidit." I shall add, as what appears to me still more surprising, that Beza's "ego verò existi- "mo," enforced merely by his own example, should, with so many modern editors, and some translators, prove more than a counterpoise to all the authorities of MSS. and versions which can be pleaded against it.

28. *To eat the passover*. Ch. xiv. 14. N.

31. *We are not permitted*, *ἡμιν ουκ εξεστιν*. Whether the power of judging, in capital cases, was taken from them by the Romans, or was, in effect, as Lightfoot has rendered very probable, (Hor. Heb. Mt. xxvi. 3. J. xviii. 31.) abandoned by themselves, is not material. The resumption of a power which has long gone into disuse, is commonly dangerous, sometimes impracticable. What is never done, is everywhere considered, as what cannot legally be done.

37. *Thou art king then? Ουκουν βασιλευς ει συ;* E. T. *Art thou a king then?* As to the form of the interrogation, see the pa-

rallel passage in Mt.; as to the expression *βασιλευς ει*, though it be not so definite, and, consequently, so emphatical, as if it had the article; it is not, on the other hand, so indefinite as it is in the E. T. by being rendered *a king*. This would never have been said of one who claimed to be king of the country, which was, doubtless, Pilate's view of our Lord's pretensions. The expression, *a king*, on the contrary, suggests the notion of foreign dominions. The import of the original is sufficiently expressed in our language, by the omission of the definite article, a thing not uncommon in conversation; and the more natural here, as the words are a repetition of what had been expressed more fully, verse 33. For I have had occasion to observe before, that such ellipses are often adopted in repeating phrases which have but very lately occurred. Ch. xix. 12. N.

40. *Then they all cried*, *εκραυγασαν ουν παλιν παντες*. E. T. *Then cried they all again*. The word *παλιν* is wanting in a considerable number of MSS. in the Com. edition, the Sy. Cop. Sax. Ara. Arm. and Eth. versions. In many La. MSS. it is not found. Besides, it does not suit the preceding part of our Lord's trial, as related by this Evangelist, who makes no mention of their crying in this manner before.

CHAPTER XIX.

2. *A purple mantle*, *ἱματιον πορφυρουν*. It is called, Mt. xxvii. 28. *a scarlet cloak*, *χλαμυδα κοκκινην*. The names denoting the colour of the garment, ought to be understood with all the latitude common in familiar conversation. This cloak, in strictness, may have been neither purple nor scarlet, and yet have had so much of each, as would naturally lead one to give it one of these names, and another the other.

12. *Whoever calleth himself king*, *πας ὁ βασιλεα αὑτον ποιων*. E. T. *Whosoever maketh himself a king*. That the verb *ποιειν* here means no more than *to call*, is evident from verse 7th. We have, in this verse, an example of what was observed on ch. xviii. 37. The sentence whereof these words are a part, is true, when *βασιλεα* is rendered *king*, but not when rendered *a king*. Judea,

at that time, together with Syria, to which it was annexed, made a province of the empire. Nothing more certain, than that whoever, in Judea, called himself *king*, in the sense wherein the word was commonly understood, opposed Cæsar; for if the kingdom to which he laid claim, was without the bounds of the Roman empire, the title nowise interfered with the rights of the emperor. So much does the significance of a sentence sometimes depend on what would be thought a very minute circumstance.

14. *Now it was the preparation of the paschal-sabbath*, ην δε παρασκευη του πασχα. E. T. *And it was the preparation of the passover.* The word παρασκευη, in the N. T. denotes always in my opinion, the day before the Sabbath. My reasons for this opinion are as follows: 1st, The explanation now given, coincides exactly with the definition which Mr. gives of that word, ch. xv. 42. ην παρασκευη ὁ εστι προσαββατον. *It was the preparation, that is, the eve of the Sabbath.* 2dly, The word occurs six times in the N. T.; and, in all these places, confessedly means the sixth day of the week, answering to our Friday, and consequently before the Jewish Sabbath, or Saturday. 3dly, The preparation of all things necessary the day before the Sabbath, that they might be under no temptation to violate the sabbatical rest, was expressly commanded in the law. Ex. xvi. 5. 23. There was nothing analagous to this enjoined in preparation for the other feasts. But it may be objected, that, in the passage under consideration, the expression is παρασκευη του πασχα. To this it has been answered, and I think justly, that the word πασχα was not always confined to the sacrifice of the lamb or the kid, appointed to be on the fourteenth of the month Nisan, at even; but was often extended to the whole of the festival, which began with the paschal sacrifice, properly so called, and continued the seven days of unleavened bread which immediately followed. The whole time is called indifferently, sometimes *the feast of the passover*, sometimes *the feast of unleavened bread.* In further confirmation of this, it has been observed, that other sacrifices offered during that period, were sometimes termed *the passover.* Deut. xvi. 2. it is said, *thou shalt sacrifice the passover unto the Lord thy God, of the flock and the herd.* Now, the last term, *the herd*, could only relate to the other sacrifices presented during the seven days which succeeded, and not to the signal commemorative

sacrifice called, by way of eminence, *the passover*, with which the festival was introduced; for, as to it, it could be taken only from the flock. Nor does the argument rest on this single passage. In 2 Chron. xxxv. 7, 8, 9. *bullocks* (which are there improperly rendered *oxen*) are mentioned as passover offerings, in the same way with *lambs* and *kids*. Now, if the whole period, and the sacrifices offered therein, were sometimes familiarly called the passover, it is extremely probable that the Sabbath of the passover-week should, in the same way, be distinguished from other Sabbaths, especially as it appears to have been considered by them as a day peculiarly memorable. Thus, verse 31st, the Evangelist tells us, that *that Sabbath* (he is speaking of the day after our Lord's crucifixion) *was a great day*. I have, therefore, for the sake of perspicuity, rendered the word πασχα here, *paschal-sabbath*. This serves also to account for what we are told, ch. xviii. 28. that the Jews *entered not the pretorium, lest they should be defiled, and so not in a condition to eat the passover*. If we suppose (and, in this supposition, there is surely nothing incongruous) that the Evangelist used the word in the same latitude that Moses and the writer of the Chronicles did, in the passages above quoted, the whole difficulty vanishes. No more is meant by *eating the passover*, than partaking in the sacrifices offered during the days of unleavened bread, which the rabbies have since distinguished by the name *chagiga*. Others have attempted to remove these difficulties by supposing that our Lord anticipated the legal time, that he might have an opportunity of eating the passover before his death; a thing extremely improbable in every view. It does not suit the circumstances of the story, as related by Mt. Mr. and L. (for, as to this, J. is silent), who all speak of it just as men would speak of a festival, celebrated at the known and stated time, and in the usual manner, and not in a way singular and irregular. Further, there is no omission of duty in not celebrating an anniversary which one does not live to see: but in anticipating the time, there would have been a real transgression of the commandment, which expressly confined the observance to the fourteenth day of the month, permitting no change of the day, except in a particular case of uncleanness, which is not pretended to have taken place here; and in which case the choice of another day is not left open, but the time is fixed to the fourteenth of the ensuing month. Add to

this that, in such an anticipation of the sacrifice, the concurrence of some of the priesthood would have been necessary (see 2 Chr. xxx. 15, 16, 17. xxxv. 11.), which, we have reason to believe, could not have been obtained. To obviate these objections, distinctions have been devised, of which we find not a vestige in Scripture, or in the writings of the rabbies. Such is that of Gro. between the paschal sacrifice and the paschal commemoration. The latter he supposes our Lord to have solemnized, but not the former. A manner of solving difficulties, so hypothetical, and so fanciful, as it offers no evidence, needs no confutation. Those who choose to see a fuller discussion of this matter may consult Lightfoot Horæ Heb. on Mr. xiv. 12. and J. xviii. 28. or Whitby's Appendix to the fourteenth chapter of Mr.

[2] *About the sixth hour*, ὡρα δε ὡσει ἑκτη. As this does not perfectly accord with Mr. (xv. 25.), who says, *it was the third hour when they nailed him to the cross*, such an appearance of contradiction could not fail to be soon observed; and the observation has not failed of producing the usual effect—the correction of one Gospel by another. Accordingly, the Cam. MS. reads τριτη; but little regard is due to this, if Wetstein's remark be just, that the leaf is not written by the hand which wrote the rest of the MS. but appears, from the character, to be of a much later date. Certain it is, that, in the La. translation wherewith that copy is accompanied, the word is *sexta*. There are only three other MSS. of little account, which read τριτη. Nonnus also has read thus: but not one of the ancient translators. Eusebius, and, after him, other Gr. commentators, favour this reading. Dod. in his Paraphrase, adopts it, though he translates the words in the common way. He supports his opinion, in a note, from a passage found in a fragment of Peter of Alexandria; concerning which, Wet. observes, that Petavius has shown that Peter was not the author. The common hypothesis is, that some early transcriber has mistaken the Γ, the numeral mark for 3, for the ϛ, the mark for 6; and thus has substituted ἑκτη instead of τριτη. Others suppose that J. speaks of the condemnation of Jesus, Mr. of the crucifixion; that J. reckons the hours as we do, and means 6 in the morning; Mr. speaks in the Jewish manner, and means 9; and that, consequently, three hours intervened between the sentence and the execution. Abstracting from other improbabil-

ities in this account, it is manifest, from several places of this Gospel, ch. i. 39. iv. 6. 52. that J. like all the other evangelists, reckoned the hours in the Jewish manner. Harmer's solution (Vol. 3. Obs. 40.) that "it was the sixth hour, not of the day, "but of the preparation of the passover peace-offerings," does not satisfy. When the historian said, *Ην δε παρασκευη*, *It was the preparation*, he plainly named, and has been always understood to name, the day of the week. Now it is well known that the whole Friday was so called, without regard to the time actually spent in preparation. Nor is there ground to think that there was any allusion to the passover peace-offerings. It was the preparation requisite for the due observance of the sabbath, which alone occasioned this name being given to the day. Had the preparation necessary for the sacrifices given ground for this appellation, every day had been a *paraskeue*, as every day, more especially every festival, there were sacrifices. Now it is evident that the name *paraskeue* among the Jews, was as much appropriated to the sixth day of the week, as the name *sabbath* was to the seventh. Mr. gives us *προσαβ?ατον* as a synonymous term. For my part, I prefer the solution (though it may be accounted but an imperfect one) given by those who consider the day as divided into four parts, answering to the four watches of the night. These coincided with the hours of 3, 6, 9, and 12, or, in our way of reckoning, 9, 12, 3, and 6, which suited also the solemn times of sacrifice and prayer in the temple; that, in cases wherein they did not think it of consequence to ascertain the time with great accuracy, they did not regard the intermediate hours, but only those more noted divisions which happened to come nearest the time of the event spoken of. Mr. says, *ην ὡρα τριτη*; from which we have reason to conclude, that *the third hour* was past. J. says, *ὡρα ὡσει ἑκτη*; from which I think it probable, that *the sixth hour* was not yet come. On this supposition, though the Evangelists may, by a fastidious reader, be accused of want of precision in regard to dates, they will not by any judicious and candid critic, be charged with falsehood or misrepresentation. Who would accuse two modern historians with contradicting each other, because, in relating an event which had happened between 10 and 11 forenoon, one had said it was past 9 o'clock: the other, it was drawing towards noon?

23. *His mantle*, *τα ἱματια αυτου*. Ch. xiii. 4. N.

25. *Mary*, *the wife of Cleophas*, *Μαρια ἡ του Κλωπα*. The Ara. version renders it, *Mary*, *the daughter of Cleophas*. The original expression is susceptible of either interpretation. Mt. i. 6. N. I have followed the generality of interpreters, who think that Cleophas here is another name for him called Alpheus. Mt. x. 3.

29. *Having fastened it to a twig of hyssop*, *ὑσσωπῳ περιθεντες*. There must have been some plant in Judea of the lowest class of trees or shrubs, which was either a species of hyssop, or had a strong resemblance to what the Greeks called *ὑσσωπος*; inasmuch as the Hellenist Jews always distinguished it by that name. Indeed, the Gr. word, if we may judge from its affinity in sound, is probably derived from the Heb. name אזוב, *ezob*. It is said of Solomon, 1 Ki. iv. 33. that *he spake of trees, from the cedar tree that is in Lebanon, even unto the hyssop that springeth out of the wall*. Now, they did not reckon among trees any plants but such as had durable and woody stalks. (See N. on Mt. vi. 30.) That their *hyssop* was of this kind, is evident, also, from the uses of sprinkling, to which it is, in many cases, appointed by the law to be applied.

30. *Yielded up his spirit*, *παρεδωκε το πνευμα*. Mt. xxvii. 30. N.

40. *Which is the Jewish manner of embalming*, *καθως ἐθος εστι τοις Ἰουδαιοις ἐνταφιαζειν*. E. T. *As the manner of the Jews is to bury*. But the proper meaning of the verb *ἐνταφιαζειν* is not *to bury*, but *to embalm*, or to prepare the body for burial—*pollincire*, *corpus ad sepulturam componere*. The Vul. indeed, renders the clause *sicut mos est Judaeis sepelire*, which is the real source of the error in modern translations. Suffice it to observe here, that the verb *ἐνταφιαζειν*, and the verbal noun *ἐνταφιασμος*, are used in the N. T. only in relation to the embalming of the body of our Lord. The word used for *to bury*, is invariably *θαπτειν*. The use followed by the Sep. is entirely similar: *ἐνταφιαζειν* is *to prepare the corpse*; *θαπτειν* is *to bury*. The import of both words, and, consequently, the distinction between them, is exemplified, Gen. l. 2. 5. In verse 2d, *προσεταξεν Ἰωσηφ τοις παισιν αυτου τοις ἐνταφιασταις ἐνταφιασαι τον πατερα αυτου, και ἐνεταφιασαν οἱ ἐνταφιασται τον Ἰσραηλ*. E. T. *Joseph commanded his servants, the physicians, to embalm his father; and the physicians embalmed Israel*. Whereas, in verse 5th, Joseph's words to Pharaoh

are—Ὁ πατηρ μου ὡρκισε με, λεγων, Ἐν τῳ μνημειῳ ᾧ ωρυξα εμαυτῳ εν γῃ Χανααν, εκει με θαψεις· νυν ουν αναβας, θαψω τον πατερα μου. E. T. *My father made me swear, saying,* "*In my* "*grave which I have digged for me in the land of Canaan, there shalt* "*thou bury me.*" *Now, therefore, let me go up, I pray thee, and bury my father.* Here the difference between the two verbs is distinctly marked. The former, το ενταφιαζειν, was the work of *the physicians*, according to the import of the Heb. term, or of *the embalmers*, according to the Gr.; the latter, το θαπτειν, was the work of Joseph, and the company who attended him: the former was executed in Egypt, the latter in Canaan. Let it be observed further, that the two Gr. words are the translation of two Heb. words, which are never used promiscuously, or mistaken for each other. In this passage, which is the only place wherein the Seventy have used the verb ενταφιαζειν, the Vul. has carefully preserved the distinction. It renders ενταφιαζειν, *aromatibus condire*, and θαπτειν, *sepelire*. To a judicious Eng. reader, who considers the vast quantity of the most costly aromatics which, the Evangelist tells us, were bestowed by Nicodemus on the body of our Lord, the clause subjoined, *as the manner of the Jews is to bury*, must have a very strange appearance. The first reflection that would naturally arise in his mind would be, 'If so, surely not one of a 'hundred of the people could afford to be buried.' Yet certain it is, that no nation was more careful than the Jewish, to bury their dead, though, very probably, not one of a hundred was embalmed. But it had been predicted of our Lord, not only that he should be numbered with *transgressors* (malefactors), not only that his grave should be appointed with the wicked (which was the case of those who suffered, as criminals, by public justice; Nicolai de Sepulchris Hebraeorum, Lib. III Cap. ١.); but that he should be joined with the rich in his death; circumstances which, before they happened, it was very improbable, should ever concur in the same person.——L. Cl. and Si. are the only French translators who seem to have been sensible of the proper meaning of ενταφιαζειν. The former says, *selon la coutume que les Juifs ont de preparer les corps pour les ensevelir;* the latter, *comme le pratiquent les Juifs avant que d' ensevelir leurs morts.* The late Eng. translations follow implicitly the common version.

CHAPTER XX.

1. *Saw that the stone had been removed.* *Βλεπει τον λιθον ηρμενον.* E. T. *Seeth the stone taken away.* The import of this Eng. expression is that she was present at the removing of the stone. The Gr. plainly implies that it had been removed before she came; *ηρμενον* is not the present but the preter-perfect participle. The Vul. *vidit lapidem sublatum*, where the word is equivocal, has misled our Interpreters. The La. has not like the Gr. distinct participles for the present and for the past. None of the Eng. translations I have seen, except the An. Dod. and Hey. have escaped this blunder. None of the Fr. Catholic or protestant, have fallen into it. Lu. in Ger. has avoided it, so has Dio. in Ita.

8. *Believed* [*the report*], *επιστευσε.* E. T. *Believed.* It naturally occurs here to ask what? The active verb *believe*, in our language, requires, in every case, where it is not manifest from the preceding words, the addition of the thing believed. Was this in the present instance, our Lord's resurrection? No: that had not yet been reported to him, or so much as insinuated. Mary Magdalene had affirmed only that the body had been carried off, and that she knew not where they had laid it. Besides, we learn, from what immediately follows, that our Lord's first appearance to her (and to her the Evangelist Mr. informs us, xvi. 9. that he appeared first of all) was after the two disciples had left the place. The ellipsis here, therefore, is most naturally supplied by the words *the report*, to wit, that made by Mary above recited, which had occasioned the visit made at that time to the sepulchre, by the two disciples. The Cam. MS. reads *ουκ επιστευσεν.* But in this that MS. is singular, not having the support of any MS. or version. Even the La. translation, with which it is accompanied, has no negative particle.

10. *To their companions*, *προς εαυτους.* E. T. *Unto their own home.* The words are capable of either interpretation; but I have, with Dod. adopted the former, as it suits better what is related both by this, and by the other Evangelists; from all of whom we learn that our Lord's disciples spent much of this day together.

17. *Lay not hands on me.* *Μη μου ἅπτου.* E. T. *Touch me not.* The verb *ἅπτεσθαι* in the use of the Seventy, denotes not only *to touch*, but *to lay hold on, to cleave to*, as in Job xxxi. 7. Ezek. xli. 6. and other places. The sense here plainly is, 'Do not de-'tain me at present. The time is precious. Lose not a moment, 'therefore, in carrying the joyful tidings of my resurrection to my 'disciples.'

19. *Jesus came where the disciples were convened, the doors having been shut for fear of the Jews.* *και των θυρων κεκλεισμενων, ὁπου ησαν οἱ μαθηται συνηγμενοι, δια τον φοβον των Ἰουδαιων, ηλθεν ὁ Ἰησους.* E. T. *When the doors were shut, where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus.* This arrangement does not well in English: if it do not suggest a false meaning, it at least renders the true meaning obscure. The disciples assembled, but surely not for fear of the Jews; for, as they did not intend by violence to oppose violence, if any should be offered them, they could not but know that to assemble themselves would more expose them to danger than any other measure they could take. The plain matter is; they assembled for mutual advice and comfort, and being assembled, the doors were shut for fear of the Jews, as they were well aware of the consequence of being discovered at such a time, in consultation together. On the other hand, the words do not necessarily imply, that, whilst the doors continued shut, our Lord entered miraculously. *Κεκλεισμενων* is even more literally rendered *having been shut*, than *being shut*, or *when they were shut;* as it is the preterperfect, not the present or imperfect participle. They may have been, therefore, for aught related by the Evangelist, made by miracle to fly open and give him access.

25. *Put my finger into the print of the nails.* *βαλω τον δακτυλον μου εις τον τυπον των ηλων.* Vul. *Mittam digitum meum in locum clavorum.* The Al. and four other MSS. have *τοπον* for *τυπον*. The Sy. as well as the Vul. and Sax. follows this reading. The sense is the same.

27. *Be not incredulous, but believe.* *μη γινου απιστος, αλλα πιστος.* E. T. *Be not faithless, but believing.* The word *faithless* is here used in a sense in which it is now obsolete. Both the Gr. words *πιστος* and *απιστος*, in this passage, are to be under-

stood as merely Hellenistical for *credens* and *non credens*, a sense in which they frequently occur in the N. T. See Acts x. 45. xvi. 1. 1 Cor. vii. 12, 13, 14. 1 Tim. iv. 3. 10. 12. v. 16. vi. 2. In these commonly the meaning has been justly exhibited by interpreters. In rendering Gal. iii. 9. *ὡστε οἱ ἐκ πιστεως εὐλογουνται συν τῳ πιστῳ Ἀβρααμ*, our translators have been rather unlucky in an expression which, if not improper at the time, was, at least equivocal, and darkened the sense. *So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham.* The connection here appears more in the sound than in the sense. Properly, *They, therefore, who believe, are blessed with Abraham who believed.*

30, 31. *Many other miracles*, &c. Grotius is of opinion that this Gospel concludes with these two verses, and that the following chapter has been afterwards annexed by the church of Ephesus, in like manner as the last chapter of the pentateuch, and the last of Josephus have, after the death of the authors, been added by the sanhedrim. His reasons are, 1. The resemblance which this bears to the conclusion of the next chapter, v. 24, 25. 2 The designation of the author there by the 3d person sing. *his testimony.* 3. The application that is made of the 1st person plur. *We know.* In regard to the first, it has been justly observed, that, with equal reason, the three last verses of the epistle to the Romans may be accounted spurious. As to the other two, suffice it to observe, that it is not uncommon in the apostle John, to speak of himself either in the 3d person sing. (as in ch. xiii. 23, &c. xviii. 15, 16. xix. 26, 27. 35. xx. 2, &c.) or in the 1st person plur. (as in ch. i. 14. 16. 1 Jo. i. 1, 2, &c.) This notion of Gro. deserves, therefore, to be rated as merely a modern conjecture opposed to the testimony of all ecclesiastical antiquity, MSS. editions, versions, commentaries, which uniformly attest the last chapter, as much as any other in the book.

CHAPTER XXI.

7. *Girt on his upper garment, τον επενδυτην διεζωσατο.* E. T. *He girt his fisher's coat unto him. Επενδυτης*, agreeably to its etymology from *επενδυω, super induo*, signifies an upper garment. It occurs in no other place of the N. T.; but, from the use the Seventy have made of it in the Old, there is no reason to confine

the meaning to the garb of any particular profession, or even to that of either sex. In one of the only two places wherein it occurs in the Sep. (1 Sam. xviii. 4.) it is used for the robe or loose upper garment worn by Jonathan the son of Saul; in the other (2 Sam. xiii. 18.) for that worn by the virgin daughters of the king. I cannot approve, therefore, the Vul. Er. and Leo de Juda, for rendering it *tunica;* nor Cas. who translates it *indusium.* I think Be. has done better in making it *amiculum.*

2 *Which he had laid aside,* ην γαρ γυμνος. E. T. *For he was naked.* But γυμνος does not always like the Eng. word *naked,* signify having no clothes on, or being totally uncovered, but not having all the clothes usually worn, particularly not having his mantle. In this sense the word seems to be used, Acts xix. 16. and in several passages of the O. T.

12. *Come and dine,* δευτε, αριστησατε. Vul. Er. Zu. Be. *Venite, prandete.* Cas. *Adeste prandete.* Dod. *Come and refresh yourselves.* Wy. *Come, eat.* Bishop Pearce approves rather, *Come and breakfast,* because it was early, as we learn from verse 4. The same is the reason with the other two Eng. interpreters for departing from the common method. I do not think it a good reason. The ancients used regularly but two meals, we use three. As of our three, dinner and supper have been regarded as the two principal, it has obtained not only with us, but, I believe, over all Europe, to call the first meal of the ancients, which the Greeks named το αριστον, and the Latins *prandium,* by the first of the two, which is *dinner,* and the second, το δειπνον of the Greeks, and *cœna* of the Latins, by the last, which is *supper.* It is the order that has fixed the names, and not the precise time of the day at which they were eaten. This is commonly variable, and the names cannot be gradually altered with the fashions, much less can they be accommodated to every occasional convenience. Our ancestors dined at eleven forenoon, and supped at five afternoon. But it will not be thought necessary that we should call the breakfast of our fashionable people dinner, and their dinner supper, because they coincide in time with those meals of their progenitors. To introduce the name *breakfast* would but mislead by giving a greater appearance of similarity in their manners to our own, than fact will justify. *Refresh yourselves* is a very vague expression.

[2] *None of the disciples*, *ουδεις των μαθητων*. Vul. *Nemo discumbentium*, doubtless from some copy which has read *ανακειμενων*. In this the Vul. has only the concurrence of the Sax. version.

[3] *Ventured to ask him*, *ετολμα εξετασαι αυτον*. E. T. *Durst ask him*. An. and Hey. say *Offered*. Dod. Wes. Wor. and Wy. *Presumed*. Priestley, *thought it necessary*. Bishop Pearce has justly remarked concerning the verb *τολμαω* followed by an infinitive, that it does not always, in the use of Gr. authors, sacred or profane, express the boldness or courage implied in the Eng. verb *to dare*, by which it is commonly rendered. But it is equally true, on the other hand, that it is not a mere expletive. When joined with a negative, as in this place, it often expresses a disinclination arising from modesty, delicacy, respect, or an averseness to be troublesome in putting unnecessary questions. The words immediately following, *knowing that it was the master*, confirm the interpretation now given. The common version, *durst not*, tends to convey the notion, that our Lord's manner of conversing with his disciples was harsh and forbidding, than which nothing can be more contrary to truth. *Did not presume*, is better, as it does not suggest any austerity in our Lord; but it plainly implies what is not implied in the words: that, in the historian's judgment, there would have been presumption in putting the question. The word *offered* is a mere expletive. *Thought it necessary*, though yielding an apposite meaning in this place, is evidently not the meaning of *ετολμα*. The terms *ventured not*, in my opinion, come up entirely to the sense of the author; which is, to express a backwardness proceeding from no other fear than that which may be the consequence of the most perfect esteem and veneration. When those spoken of are either enemies or indifferent persons, the verb *ετολμα* may not improperly be rendered *presumed* or *durst*. But that is not the case here. See Mr. xii. 34. N.

15. *Lovest thou me more than these? αγαπας με πλειον τουτων;* There is an ambiguity here in the original, which, after the Eng. translators, I have retained in the version. It may either mean, *Lovest thou me more than thou lovest these things?* that is, thy boats, nets, and other implements of fishing, by which thou earnest a livelihood? or, *Lovest thou me more than these men* [thy fellow-disciples] *love me?* In the first way interpreted, the

question is neither so cold nor so foreign, as some have represented it. This was probably the last time that Peter exercised his profession as a fisherman. Jesus was about to employ him as an apostle; but as he disdained all forced obedience, and would accept no service that did not spring from choice, and originate in love, he put this question to give Peter an opportunity of professing openly his love, which his late transgression had rendered questionable, and consequently his preference of the work in which Jesus was to employ him, with whatever difficulties and perils it might be accompanied, to any wordly occupation, however gainful. In the other way interpreted, the question must be considered as having a reference to the declaration formerly made by Peter, when he seemed to arrogate a superiority above the rest, in zeal for his Master, and steadiness in his service. *Though thou shouldst prove a stumbling-stone to them all* (says he, Mt. xxvi. 33.) *I never will be made to stumble.* This gives a peculiar propriety to Peter's reply here. Convinced at length that his Master knew his heart better than he himself, conscious at the same time, of the affection which he bore him, he dares make the declaration, appealing to the infallible Judge before whom he stood, as the voucher of his truth. But, as to his fellow-disciples, he is now taught not to assume in any thing. He dares not utter a single word which would lead to a comparison with those to whom, he knew, his woful defection had made him appear so much inferior. To the second interpretation I know it is objected, that our Lord cannot be supposed to ask Peter a question, which the latter was not in a capacity to answer: for, though he was conscious of his own love, he could have no certain knowledge of the love of others. But to this it may be justly answered, that such questions are not understood to require an answer from knowledge, but from opinion. Peter had once shown himself forward enough to obtrude his opinion unasked, to the disadvantage of the rest, compared with himself. His silence now on that part of the question which concerned his fellow-disciples, speaks strongly the shame he had on recollecting his former presumption in boasting superior zeal and firmness; and shows that the lesson of humility and self-knowledge he had so lately received, had not been lost.—I incline rather to this second interpretation: but, as the construction will admit either, and as neither of them is unsuitable to the context and the occasion, I thought it the safer method in a translator, to give the expression in the

same extent in which the Evangelist has given it, and leave the choice free to his readers. It may be proper just to mention a third meaning which has been put upon the words, and of which, it must be owned, they are naturally susceptible: *Lovest thou me more than thou lovest these thy fellow disciples?* This, in my judgment, is the least probable of them all. Our Lord was so far from ever showing a jealousy of this kind, lest any of his disciples should rival him in the affection of the rest, that it was often his aim to excite them, in the warmest manner, to mutual love; urging, amongst other motives, that he would consider their love to one another as the surest evidence of their regard and affection to him, and requiring such manifestations of their love to the brethren, as he had given of his love to them, and as show it to be hardly possible that they could exceed this way.

16. *Tend my sheep*, ποιμαινε τα προβατα μου. E. T. *Feed my sheep.* This is the translation given also to the words *Βοσκε τα προβατα μου* in the next verse. But the precepts are not synonymous. The latter is properly, provide them in pasture; the former implies also guide, watch, and defend them. As there is in the original some difference in every one of the three injunctions at this time laid on Peter, there ought to be a corresponding difference in the version. Yet none of our Eng. interpreters seem to have adverted to this. The Vul. must have read differently, as it has *Pasce agnos meos.* But in this reading it has not the support of a single MS. and only the Sax. version.

22, 23. *If I will that he wait my return*, εαν αυτον θελω μενειν εως ερχομαι. Vul. *Sic eum volo manere donec veniam.* This version, which totally alters the sense, has no support from Gr. MSS. or fathers, or from any ancient translation but the Sax. The Cam. verse 22. reads, Εαν αυτον θελω ουτως μενειν; but, as it retains εαν, the addition of ουτως makes no material change in the sense; whereas the Vul. has, in both verses, turned a mere supposition into an affirmation. Some La. MSS. read, agreeably to the Cam. *Si sic eum volo manere;* and some agreeably to the common Gr. *Si eum volo manere.* The Jesuit Maldonat gives up the reading of the Vul. in this place entirely, and even expresses himself with an asperity which will be thought surprising, when it is considered that his argument here hurts not the Protestants, but his own friends and brethren alone. Speaking of the three La. read-

ings given above, he says, "Prima est illa maximè vulgaris, quæ "in omnes fere Latinos pervasit codices, eosque incredibili scrip- "torum negligentia contaminavit, *Sic eum volo manere donec ve-* "*niam, quid ad te?* nulla prorsus specie probabilitatis," &c. Where is now the merit which this son of Loyola boasted (when, commenting on a passage liable to the like objections) of resigning entirely his own judgment in deference to the authority of the church? Ch. viii. 1—11. N. There indeed, after candidly admitting the weight of the arguments on the opposite side, he replies in this manner: "Sed hæc omnia minus habent ponderis "quam una auctoritas ecclesiæ, quæ per concilium Tridentinum, "non solum libros omnes, quos nunc habet in usu, sed singulas "etiam ejus partes, tanquam canonicas approbavit." Had this good father forgotten that the reading "Sic eum volo manere," which he so disdainfully reprobates, has the sanction of the council of Trent, for it had been the common reading of the Vul. long before, and was in all their approved editions at the time? Had he forgotten that it was first ratified by Pope Sixtus the fifth, after the revisal appointed by him, and then by Pope Clement the eighth, after a second revisal appointed by him? Not one passage in the Vul. can claim the authority of Popes and Councils, if this cannot.

25. *I imagine the world itself would not contain.*—I agree perfectly with those interpreters who think that the hyperbole contained in this verse is much more tolerable, than the torture to which some critics have put the words, in order to make them speak a different sense. For some apposite examples of such hyperboles, both in sacred authors and in profane, I refer the reader to Bishop Pearce. For a refutation of the opinion of Ham. who seems to think that the two last verses were not written by the Evangelist, but by the Asiatic bishops, and of the opinion of Gro. and L. Cl. who think that the whole last chapter is of another hand, I refer him to Wetstein.

END OF VOLUME FOURTH.

INDEX OF TEXTS

IN THE OTHER BOOKS OF SCRIPTURE, AND THE APOCRYPHAL WRITINGS, OCCASIONALLY ILLUSTRATED.

In the references to the PRELIMINARY DISSERTATIONS, D. means Dissertation, P. Part, N. Note. In the references to the NOTES on the Gospels, the chapter and verse of the Gospel, and the number of the Note, when there are more Notes than one on the same verse, are marked in the same manner as in the Notes themselves. The Prefaces to the Gospels, thus: Pr. Mt., Pr. Mr., Pr. L., Pr. J.

GENESIS.

I. 1—5. - - - D. III. § 4—9.
— 11. - - - Mt. vi. 30.
— 16. - - - L. ix. 48.
II. 1. - - - D. III. § 8.
— 4. - - - Mt. i. 1.
— 23. - - - D. VIII. P. II. § 4.
— 24. - - - Mt. xix. 5.
VI. 9. - - - L. xvi. 8. 3.
XIII. 4. - - - J. viii. 25.
XIV. 13. - - - Pr. Mt. § 15.
XVII. 10, &c. - - J. vii. 22.
—— 12. - - - Mt. ii. 16. 3.
XXII 1. - - - Mt. iv. 7 [2].
XXIII. 3, &c. - - D. VII. P. I. § 6.
XXIV. 3. - - - Mt. xxvi. 63.
——— 18. - - D. VII. P. I. § 7.
——— 54. 56. 59. - Mt. vi. 13.
XXVI. 19. - - - J. iv. 10. [2].
XXVII. 30, &c. - - D. VI. P. III. § 4.
XXVIII. 10, &c. - - J. v. 2. [2].
XXXI. 35. - - - D. VII. P. I. § 8.
XXXII. 4, 5. - - Ibid.
XXXIII. 5. 8. - - D. VII. P. I. § 6.

XXXV. 18. - - Mt. xxvii. 50.
XXXVII. 35. - - D. VI. P. II. § 3.
XXXIX. 17. - - Mt. ii. 16.
XLI. 2, 3. - - J. ii. 14. [2].
XLII. 10. - - D. VII. P. I. § 6.
—— 38. - - D. VI. P. II. § 3.
XLIII. 18. 20. - J. viii. 25.
XLIV. 18. - - D. VII. P. I. § 6.
XLV. 8. - - D. XII. P. I. § 32.
—— 26. - - Mr. iii. 21. [4].
XLVIII. 20. - J. i. 15. [2].
XLIX. 3, 4. - L. ii. 23.
L. 2. 5. - - J. xix. 40.

EXODUS.

XII. 6. - - Mr. xv. 42.
— 14. - - Mt. xiv. 23.
— 27. - - D. VIII. P. II. § 4.
— 46. - - Mt. i. 22.
XV. 2. - - J. xi. 25.
—— 3. - - Mr. xii. 29.
XVI. 5. 23. - J. xix. 14.
XVII. 7. - - Mt. iv. 7. [2].
XVIII. 7. - - Mt. ii. 2. [2].
XIX. 10. 14. 22. - D. VI. P. IV. § 11.
XXIV. 17. - - J. v. 37, 38.

LEVITICUS.

X. 1, &c. - - D. VI. P. IV. § 14.
XI. 42, &c. - ———— § 11. 16.
— 43, &c. - - L. xiv. 26. [2].
XII. 3. - - Mt. ii. 16. [3]. J. vii. 22.
XIV. 5. - - J. iv. 10. [2].
XX. 25, 26. - D. VI. P. IV. § 11.
XXI. 1—6. - Ibid.
XXII. 32 - - D. VI. P. IV. § 14.
XXIV. 11. 14. - D. IX. P. II. § 12.
——— 15, 16. - ———— § 10.

NUMBERS.

III. 32. - - J. xv. 18.
V. 17. - - D. VI. P. IV. § 11.
— 22. - - Mt. v. 18.
IX. 12. - - Mt. i. 22.
— 15, 16. - - J. v. 37, 38.
XII. 8. - - Ibid.
XV. 37. - - Mt. ix. 20.

XV. 38, 39. - - - - D. VIII. P. III. § 2.
XIX. 7, 8. 10. - - - - L. ii. 22.
XX. 10. - - - - Pr. Mt. § 25.
— 12. - - - - D. VI. P. IV. § 14.
XXII. 29. - - - - Mt. ii. 16.
XXIV. 7. - - - - J. vii. 38.
XXXII. 19. - - - Mt. iv. 15.
——— 24. - - - ——— 4.
XXXIII. 55. - - - Mt. vii. 3.

DEUTERONOMY.

IV. 12. 15. - - - - J. v. 37, 38.
VI. 4. - - - - - Mr. xii. 29.
— 8. - - - - - Mt. xxiii. 5.
VIII. 3. - - - - Mt. iv. 4.
X. 16. - - - - D. IV. § 22.
XVI. 2. - - - - J. xix. 14.
XVIII. 10, 11. - - - D. VI. P. II. § 15.
——— 20. - - - - J. vii. 52. [2].
XXII. 12. - - - - D. VIII. P. III, § 2. Mt. ix. 20.
——— 19. - - - - L. vi. 22. [2].
———23, 24. - - - Mt. i. 19. [3].
XXIII. 12, &c. - - - D. VI. P. IV. § 10.
XXIV. 1, 2. - - - Mt. i. 19. [3].
XXV. 1. - - - - Mt. xxvii. 24.
——— 5. - - - - Mt. xxii. 24.
XXVII. 4. - - - - J. iv. 20.
XXX. 11—14. - - - L. xvii. 21.
XXXII. 4. - - - - D. VI. P. IV. § 19.
——— 17. - - - - ——— P. I. § 15.
——— 22. - - - - ——— P. II. § 6.
XXXIII. 8. - - - - ——— P. IV. § 6.

JOSHUA.

II. 9. 24. - - - - Mt. xv. 32.
III. 5. - - - - - D. VI. P. IV. § 11.
VII. 13. - - - - Ibid.
—— 18, 19. - - - J. ix. 24.
XV. 8. - - - - D. VI. P. II. § 1.
XX. 7. - - - - ——— P. IV. § 12.
XXI. 32. - - - - J. iv. 5.
XXIII. 13. - - - - Mt. vii. 3.
XXIV. 19. - - - - D. VI. P. IV. § 14.

JUDGES.

I. 16. - - - - - Mr. i. 3.
IX. 7. - - - - Mt. vi. 30.

XVI. 10. - - - Mt. ii. 16.
XVII. 3. - - - D. VI. P. IV. § 12.

RUTH.

I. 11. - - - J. xv. 6.
II. 4. - - - L. i. 28. [2].

I SAMUEL.

I. 23. - - - Mt. iv. 4.
IV. 7, 8. - - - L. vi. 24, 25, 26.
— 17. - - - D. V. P. II. § 1.
VI. 20. - - - D. VI. P. IV. § 19.
VII. 9. - - - D. VII. P. II. § 7.
XIV. 45. - - - Mt. xvi. 22. [3].
XVIII. 4. - - - J. xxi. 7.
XXI. 6. - - - Mt. xii. 4.
XXIV. 6. - - - D. V. P. IV. § 1.
XXV. 21. - - - L. xx. 13.
XXVIII. 7. &c. - - D. VI. P. II. § 15.
——— 23. - - D. VIII. P. III. § 3.

II SAMUEL.

I. 17. - - - Mt. xi. 17.
— 20. - - - D. V. P. II. § 1.
XI. 11. - - - D. VII. P. I. § 7.
XII. 14. - - - D. IX. P. II. § 11.
XIII. 18. - - - J. xxi. 7.

I KINGS.

I. 14. - - - Mt. i. 22.
IV. 33. - - - J. xix. 29.
XIV. 6. - - - Mt. x. 2.
XVIII. 7. 9. 13. - - D. VII. P. I. § 6, 7.
——— 31, &c. - - ——— P. II. § 7.
XIX. 13. - - - Mt. vii. 15. [2].
—— 16. - - - D. V. P. IV. § 1.
XX. 4. - - - D. VII. P. I. § 7.
XXI. 10. - - - D. IX. P. II. § 8.

II KINGS.

I. 7, 8. - - - Mt. vii. 15. [2].
II. 13. - - - Ibid.
— 19. - - - D. VII. P. I. § 7.
IV. 16. - - - ——— § 6.
— 28. - - - ——— § 7.
VI 21. - - - Ibid.
VII. 2. 17. 19. - - Ibid.

XVIII. 30. 33, &c. - - D. IX P. II. § 10.
XIX. 4. 16. 22. 23. - - ——————— § 12.
XXII. 6, - - - Mt. xiii. 55.
XXIII. 10. - - - D. VI. P. II. § 1.

I CHRONICLES.

V. 1, 2. - - - L. ii. 23.
XI. 11. - - - J. xv. 18.
— 19. - - - Mt. xvi. 22. [3].
XVI. 22. - - - D. V. P. IV. § 2.
XXIV. 3, &c. - - L. i. 5.

II CHRONICLES.

II. 14, 15. - - - D. VII. P. I. § 7.
IV. 5. - - - J. ii. 6.
XXIV. 12. - - Mt. xiii. 55.
XXVI. 3. - - - Mt. i. 8.
XXIX. 5, &c. - - D. VI. P. IV. § 10.
XXX. 16, 17, 18. - - —— ——— § 11. J. xix. 14.
XXXIII. 6. - - ——— P. II. § 1.
XXXIV. 11. - - Mt. xiii. 55.
XXXV. 7, 8, 9. 11. - - J. xix. 14.
XXXVI. 22. - - D. VI. P. V. § 2.

EZRA.

III. 7. - - - Mt. xiii. 55.
VIII. 25. - - - D. VII. P. I. § 7.

NEHEMIAH.

III. 1. 32. - - - J. v. 2. [2].
VIII. 8. - - - D. X. P. V. § 4.
XII. 39. - - - J. v. 2. [2].
—— 46. - - - J. xv. 18.
XIII. 25. - - - Mt. xv. 4.

ESTHER.

IV. 13. - - - L. xiv. 26. [2].
V. 10. - - - L. ii. 49.
VI. 12. - - - Ibid.
VII. 9. - - - Ibid.

JOB.

III. 8. - - - Mt. iii. 7.
IX. 21. 23. - - L. xii. 25.
XI. 7, 8, 9. - - D. VI. P. II. § 7.
XXXI. 7. - - - J. xx. 17.
XXXVIII. 17. - - D. VI. P. II. § 9.
XXXIX. 9. - - L. ii. 7.

PSALMS.

I. 6. - - - D. IV. § 21.
II. 2. - - - D. V. P. IV. § 3, 4.
IV. 1. - - - D. XI. P. I. § 19.
XVI. 8. - - - D. IV. § 20.
—— 10. - - - D. VI. P. II. § 3. 11.
XX. 1. 7. - - - J. xvii. 11.
XXXIV. 18. - - Mt. v. 3. [3].
XXXVII. 11. 29. - - ——— 5. [2].
XXXIX. 3. - - L. xvii. 21.
——— 5. - - L. xii. 25.
XLI. 1. - - - Mt. xiii. 19.
XLIX. 2. - - - D. V. P. IV. § 13.
LXIII. title. - - Mr. i. 3.
——— 1. - - - Mt. v. 6.
LXVII. 2. - - - D. X. P. II. § 4.
LXXIII. 9. - - - D. V. P. I. § 4.
LXXVI. 1. - - - J. xvii. 11.
LXXXII. 6. - - J. x. 35.
LXXXVI. 2. - - D. VI. P. IV. § 15.
XCV. 8. - - - D. IV. § 22.
XCVI. 5. - - - D. VI. P. I. § 15.
XCVIII. 3. - - L. i. 54, 55. [2].
XCIX. 3. - - - D. VI. P. IV. § 14.
CII. 25. - - - Mt. xxv. 34.
CIII. 1. - - - L. xvii. 21.
CIV. 4. - - - D. VIII. P. III. § 10.
CV. 15. - - - D. V. P. IV. § 2.
CVI. 7. - - - Mt. xiii. 19.
—— 16. - - - D. VI. P. IV. § 5.
CIX. 16. - - - L. i. 54, 55. [2].
—— 22. - - - L. xvii. 21.
CXI. 9. - - - D. VI. P. IV. § 14.
CXVIII. 26. - - D. V. P. II. § 12. Mt. xi. 3.
CXXXI. 2. - - L. xiv. 26. [2].
CXXXII. 17. - - J. v. 35.
CXXXIX. 8. - - D. VI. P. II. § 7.
CXLV. 17. - - ——— P. IV. § 19.

PROVERBS.

V. 4. - - - Mt. xxvii. 34.
VI. 32. - - - Mt. v. 28.
VIII. passim. - - J. i. 1.
XIV. 4. - - - L. ii. 7.
XVII. 15. - - - D. VI. P. IV. § 17. Mt. xxvii. 24.
——— 20. - - D. IV. § 22.
XXI. 12. - - - Mt. xiii. 19.

XXIII. 1. - - - D. VIII. P. III. § 3.
XXIV. 10. - - - Mt. xv. 32.
XXIX. 24. - - - L. xiv. 26. [2].
XXX. 30. - - - L. i. 28. [3].

ECCLESIASTES.

V. 2. - - - L. ii. 14.
VIII. 11. - - - L. i. 1.

CANTICLES.

I. 8. - - - L. i. 28. [3].
III 10. - - - L. xvii. 21.
VIII. 6. - - - D. VI. P. II. § 10.

ISAIAH.

I. 3. - - - L. ii. 7.
— 29. - - - L. xvi. 21.
II. 20. - - - D. XI. P. I. § 19.
V. 1. - - - D. X. P. IV. § 6.
— 4. - - - Mt. xvii. 34.
— 14. - - - D. VI. P. II. § 8.
— 20. - - - L. xxiii. 54. J. i. 1. [2].
VI. 1, &c. - - D. VI. P. IV. § 14.
VII. 23. - - - D. VIII. P. I. § 10.
VIII. 12, 13. - - D. VI. P. IV. § 14.
—— 19. - - - —— P. II. § 15. D. I. P. II. § 3.
XI. 1. - - - Mt. ii. 23. [2].
XII. 1. - - - Mt. xi. 25. [2].
XIV. 9. - - - D. VI. P. II. § 8.
—— 21. - - - L. xxii. 36.
XVI. 11. - - - L. xvii. 21.
XXIX. 4. - - - D. I. P. II. § 3. D. VI. P. II. § 15.
——— 11, 12. - - J. vii. 15.
——— 19. - - L. vi. 35.
XXX. 24. - - - Mt. iii. 12.
XXXIV. 13. - - Mt. xxvii 29.
XXXVIII. 10. - - D. VI. P. II. § 17.
XL. 3. - - - ——— P. V. § 4.
—— 30, 31. - - Mt. xv. 32.
XLI. 7. - - - Mt. xiii. 55.
XLII. 1. - - - L. xxiii. 35.
—— 3. - - - Mt. xii. 20.
—— 18. - - - Mr. viii. 24.
XLV. 1. - - - D. V. P. IV. § 2.
XLVIII. 13. - - Mt. xxv. 34.
LII. 7. - - - D. V. P. II. § 3.
LIII. 8. - - - L. xvi. 8. [3].

LIII. 9. - - - D. XII. P. II. § 14.
LV. 1, 2. - - - Mt. v. 6.
—— 3. - - - D. VI. P. IV. § 4.
LVIII. 2. - - - L. xvi. 21.
LIX. 17. - - - D. VIII. P. III. § 2.
LXI. 1, 2. - - - D. V. P. II. § 2. P. IV. § 3. D. VI. P. V. § 5.
LXIII. 18. - - - D. XI. P. I. § 19.
LXV. 5. - - - D. VI. P. IV. § 11.
LXVI. 24. - - - D. XII. P. I. § 30.

JEREMIAH.

I. 5. - - - D. VI. P. IV. § 13.
IV. 13. - - - L. vi. 24, 25, 26.
VI. 4. - - - Ibid. D. VI. P. IV. § 12.
IX. 17, 18. 20. - - Mt. xi. 17. L. xxii. 36.
XII. 3. - - - D. VI. P. IV. § 12.
XXXIX. 11. 13. - - D. VII. P. II. § 4.
XLIV. 17. - - - Mt. iv. 4.
XLIX. 36. - - - D. VIII. P. III. § 11.

LAMENTATIONS.

III. 15. - - - Mt. xxvii. 34.
V. 16. - - - L. vi. 24, 25, 26.

EZEKIEL.

III. 7. - - - D. IV. §. 22.
XXXIX. 17—20. - - L. xxii. 36.
XLI. 6. - - - J. xx. 17.

DANIEL.

I. 3. 7, 8, 9. 18. - - D. VII. P. II. § 4.
II. 18, 19. 27, 28, 29, 30. 47. D. IX. P. I. § 4.
—— 44. - - - D. V. P. I. § 1.
IV. 9. - - - ———— § 4.
—— 26. - - - D. V. P. I. § 4.
VII. 13, 14. - - ———— § 1. & P. IV. § 13.
VIII. 1, - - - J. viii. 25.
IX. 25, 26. - - D. V. P. IV. § 3.
X. 16. - - - L. xvii. 21.

HOSEA.

I. 1, 2. - - - Mr. i. 1.
XI. 1. - - - Mt. i. 22.

AMOS.

II. 6. - - - Mt. x. 10. [3].
VI. 4. - - - D. VIII. P. III. § 3.

VIII. 6. - - - Mt. x. 10. [3].
IX. 2, 3. - - - D. VI. P. II. § 7.

JONAH.

I. 6. - - - D. VII. § 4.
III. 2. - - - D. VI. P. V. § 28.

MICAH.

III. 5. - - - D. VI. P. IV. § 12.
IV. 6, 7. - - - D. V. P. I. § 1.
V. 2. - - - Mt. ii. 6. [2].
VI. 5. 8. - - - Mt. vi. 33.

HABAKKUK.

III. 2. - - - L. i. 54, 55. [2].

ZECHARIAH.

I. 20. - - - Mt. xiii. 55.
XI. 12, 13. - - - Mt. xxvii. 9, 10.
XIII. 4. - - - Mt. vii. 15. [2].

MALACHI.

III. 1. - - - D. VIII. P. III. § 15.

ACTS.

I. 4. 8. - - - D. V. P. II. § 14.
— 6. - - - Mt. xvii. 11.
— 13. - - - Mt. i. 6.
— 16. - - - D. XII. P. I. § 18.
II. 23. - - - D. IV. § 21. Mt. xxvi. 45. [2].
— 25. - - - ——— § 20.
— 27. 31. - - - D. VI. P. II. § 3. 11, 12.
— 38. - - - ——— P. III. § 7.
III. 16. - - - Mr. xi. 22.
— 19. - - - D. VI. P. III. § 7.
— 21. - - - Mt. xvii. 11.
IV. 1. - - - L. xxii. 52.
— 4. - - - L. i. 2.
— 6. - - - L. iii. 2.
— 26, 27. - - - D. V. P. IV. § 4.
— 32. - - - J. v. 18.
— 33. - - - L. ii. 40.
V. 24. 26. - - - L. xxii. 52.
— 33. - - - J. xii. 10.
— 34. - - - D. VII. P. II. § 6.
— 39. - - - Mt. xxv. 9.
VI. 1, &c. - - - D. I. P. I. § 6.

VI. 4. - - - L. 1. 2.
— 11. - - - D. IX. P. II. § 8.
— 13. - - - ——— § 14.
VII. 10. 20. - - L. ii. 40.
—— 53. - - - D. VIII. P. III. § 12.
—— 59. - - - D. VI. P. II. § 23.
VIII. 4. - - - L. i. 2.
—— 22. - - - D. IV. § 23. D. VI. P. III. § 7.
—— 35. - - - D. VI. P. V. § 14.
—— 39. - - - Mt. iii. 11.
IX. 29. - - - D. I. P. I. § 6.
— 31. - - - J. xiv. 16.
— 37. - - - J. ix 7.
X. 22. - - - Mt. ii. 12.
— 38. - - - D. VI. P. I. § 9.
— 44. - - - L. i. 2.
— 45. - - - J. xx. 27.
XI. 18. - - - D. VI. P. III. § 7.
— 19. - - - L. i. 2.
— 20. - - - D. I. P. I. § 6.
— 26. - - - D. IX. P. I. § 10. Mt. ii. 12.
XII. 5. - - - L. vi. 12.
XIII. 2. - - - D. XI. P. I. § 12.
—— 10. - - - D. VI. P. I. § 3.
—— 22. - - - L. iv. 22.
—— 25. - - - L. xii. 25.
—— 34. - - - D. VI. P. IV. § 4.
—— 42. - - - ——— P. V. § 12.
—— 43. - - - J. i. 17.
—— 45. - - - D. IX. P. II. § 12.
—— 50. - - - L. xiv. 1.
XIV. 15. - - - D. IV. § 25.
—— 23. - - - D. X. P. V. § 7.
—— 25. - - - L. i. 2.
XV. 37. - - - J. xii. 10.
XVI. 1. - - - J. xx. 27.
—— 6. - - - L. i. 2.
—— 13. 16. - - L. vi. 12.
—— 30. - - - D. VII. P. I. § 7.
—— 33. - - - J. ix. 7.
XVII. 3. - - - D. V. P. IV. § 6.
—— 4. - - - L. xiv. 1.
—— 11. - - - L. i. 2.
—— 13. - - - Mt. xv. 1.
—— 19. 22. - - D. VIII. P. III. § 18.
—— 18. - - - D. VI. P. I. § 12, 13. 17.
—— 22. - - - ——— § 22.

XVII. 30.	D. VI. P. III. § 7.
XVIII. 5. 28.	D. V. P. IV. § 6.
—— 6.	D. IX P. II. § 12.
—— 12.	L. ii. 2. [2].
—— 23.	L. i. 3. [2].
—— 26.	Mt. xvi. 22.
XIX 16.	J. xxi 7. [2].
XX. 7. 9.	D. VI. P. V. § 12.
—— 18.	Mt. xxviii 9.
—— 21.	D. VI. P. III § 7.
—— 24.	D. V. P. II. § 16. L. xii. 25.
—— 32.	J. i. 17.
XXI. 8.	D. VI. P. V. § 16.
—— 29.	D. IV. § 20.
XXII. 5.	L. xxii 66.
XXIII. 1.	D. IX P. II. § 13.
—— 8.	D. VI. P. II. § 23. Mt. xxii. 23.
XXIV. 5. 14, 15.	D. IX. P. IV. § 2, 3, 4.
XXV. 2.	L. xiv. 1.
—— 11. 25.	L. xxiii. 15.
—— 19.	D. VI. P. I. § 22.
XXVI. 5.	D IV. § 21. D. IX. P. IV. § 1.
—— 11.	D. IX. P. II. § 13.
—— 18.	D. X. P. IV. § 15.
—— 20.	D VI. P. III. § 7.
—— 24.	J. vii. 15.
—— 31.	L. xxiii. 15.
XXVII. 20.	Mt. xxvi. 45.
—— 40.	L. iv. 42 [2].
XXVIII. 7.	J. xv. 18.
—— 17.	L xiv. 1. J. i. 15. [3].
—— 31.	D. VI. P. V. § 7.

ROMANS.

I. 4.	D. XI. P. I. § 7.
— 9.	D.V. P II. § 19. D. XI. P. I. § 12.
II. 5.	D. VI. P. III. § 9.
— 21.	—— P. V. § 10.
III. 11.	Mt. xiii. 19.
—— 21, 22.	Mt. vi. 33.
—— 22. 26.	Mr. xi. 22.
IV. 21.	L. i. 1.
VI. 17.	Mt. xi. 25. [2].
VII. 3.	Mt. ii. 12.
—— 12.	D. VI. P. IV. § 7.
X. 1.	L. vi. 12.
— 2.	L. iv. 22.
— 3.	Mt. vi. 23.

X. 6, 7. - - - D. VI. P. II. § 14. L. xvii. 21.
— 10. - - - D. IV. § 23.
— 15. - - - D. V. P. II. § 3, 4, 5.
— 16, 17. - - - D. XII. P. I. § 15.
XI. 2. - - - D. IV. § 21.
— 14. - - - D. I. P. I. § 11. N.
— 22. - - - Mt. xxiv. 51.
— 29. - - - D. VI. P. III. § 9.
XII. 3. 6. - - - D. IV. § 13, 14.
XIV. 5. - - - L. i. 1. D. IX. P. III. § 5.
—— 17. - - - L. xvii. 21.
—— 22, 23. - - D. IV. § 14. D. IX. P. III. § 5.
XV. 30. - - - L. vi. 12.
XVI. 17. - - - D. IX. P. IV. § 11.
—— 25, 26. - - D. V. P. II. § 20. D. IX. P. I. § 3.

I CORINTHIANS.

I. 10. - - - D. IX. P. III. § 4.
— 17. - - - D. I. P. I. § 10.
— 21. - - - D. VI. P. V. § 10.
— 30. - - - J. xi. 25.
II. 4, 5. - - - D. VI. P. V. § 10. D. I. P. I. § 10.
— 7—10. - - - D. IX. P. I. § 3.
— 14. - - - J. iii. 3. [2].
III. 2. - - - L. i. 64.
— 3. - - - D. IX. P. IV. § 8.
— 11. - - - D. VII. P. II. § 11.
IV. 1. - - - D. IX. P. I. § 6.
— 6. - - - D. IX. P. IV. § 8.
V. 2. - - - Mt. v. 6.
VI. 3. - - - Mt. xii. 23.
— 12. - - - L. xxii. 25.
VII. 2. - - - J. v. 18.
—— 12, 13, 14. - - J. xx. 27.
—— 14. - - - D. VI. P. IV. § 11.
—— 39. - - - J. iii. 21.
VIII. 3. - - - D. IV. § 21.
—— 4. - - - D. VI. P. I. § 15.
—— 13. - - - J. viii. 51.
IX. 18. - - - D. V. P. II. § 19.
X. 9. - - - D. VI. P. IV. § 6.
— 16. - - - Mt. xiv. 19.
— 17. - - - Mt. xxvi. 26.
— 20, 21. - - - D. VI. P. I. § 14—18.
XI. 10. - - - D. VIII. P. III. § 12.
— 19. - - - D. IX. P. IV. § 8.
XII. 12. - - - D. V. P. IV. § 12.

XIV. 2. 12. - - D. XII. P. IV. § 9.
—— 11. - - - D. I. P. I. § 14.
—— 32. - - - —— P. II. § 3.
XV. 54. - - - L. ii. 2. [3].
—— 55. - - - D. VI. P. II. § 18. 23.
XVI. 11. - - - L. xi. 7.

II CORINTHIANS.

I. 17. - - - J. xii. 10.
— 20. - - - Mt. v. 37.
III. 14. - - - D. V. P. III. § 3.
IV. 2. - - - J. i. 17.
— 16. - - - Mt. xv. 32.
— 17. - - - D. X. P. II. § 4.
V. 6, &c. - - - D. VI. P. II. § 23.
— 13. - - - Mr. iii. 21. [4].
VI. 1. - - - J. i. 17.
— 2. - - - L. xxii. 51.
VII. 1. - - - D. I. P. I. § 11. N. 3.
—— 3. - - - D. IV. § 21.
—— 4. - - - Mt. x. 30.
—— 8. 10. - - D. VI. P. III. § 9.
VIII. 18. - - - D. V. P. II. § 19.
XII. 1, &c. - - D. VI. P. II. § 21. 23.
—— 7. - - - Mt. vii. 3.
—— 18. - - - Mt. xii. 23.
XIII. 8. - - - J. i. 17.

GALATIANS.

I. 1. - - - Mt. x. 2.
— 23. - - - D. VI. P. V. § 14.
II. 2. 7. - - - D. V. P. II. § 20.
— 3. - - - Mt. i. 19.
— 15. - - - Mt. xxvi. 45. [2].
— 16. 20. - - - Mr. xi. 22.
— 21. - - - J. i. 17.
III. 1. - - - Ibid.
— 3. - - - D. I. P. I. § 11. N.
— 9. - - - J. xx. 27.
— 19. - - - D. VIII. P. III. § 12.
— 22. - - - Mr. xi. 22.
IV. 4. - - - L. i. 35.
— 9. - - - J. iii. 3.
— 19. - - - D. V. P. IV. § 12.
— 22, &c. - - - D. IX. P. I. § 7.
V. 4. 7. - - - J. i. 17.
— 12. - - - Mt. xxiv. 51.

V. 19, 20, 21. - - D. I. P. I. § 11. N. D. IX. P. IV. § 11.
VI. 9. - - - Mt. xv. 32.

EPHESIANS.

I. 9. - - - D. IX. P. I. § 3. 11.
— 13. - - - D. V. P. II. § 16.
II. 12. - - - D. VI. P. I. § 16.
— 20. - - - D. VII. P. II. § 11.
III. 3. 5, 6. 9. - - D. IX. P. I. § 3.
— 7. - - - J. iv. 10.
— 13. - - - Mt. xv. 32.
— 18. - - - L. xi. 7.
IV. 7. - - - J. iv. 10.
— 11. - - - D. VI. P. V. § 16.
— 18. - - - D. IV. § 25. N.
— 20. - - - D. V. P. IV. § 12.
— 21. - - - J. i. 17.
— 29. - - - L. ii. 40.
V. 32. - - - D. IX. P. I. § 7. D. X. P. III. § 9.
VI. 19. - - - ———— § 3.

PHILIPPIANS.

I. 21, &c. - - - D. VI. P. II. § 23.
II. 10. - - - ———— § 6.
III. 9. - - - Mr. xi. 22.
IV. 6. - - - Mt. vi. 25.
— 15. - - - D. V. P. II. § 19.

COLOSSIANS.

I. 20. - - - Mt. v. 9.
— 26, 27. - - - D. IX. P. I. § 3.
II 22. - - - Mt. xv. 9.
III. 8. - - - D. IX. P. II. § 13.
IV. 6. - - - L. ii. 40.

I THESSALONIANS.

I. 3. - - - Mr. xi. 22.

II THESSALONIANS.

I. 12. - - - J. i. 17.
II. 7. - - - D. IX. P. I. § 4.
— 11. - - - Mt. vi. 13.
— 12. - - - Mr. xvi. 16. [3]. J. i. 17.
— 15. - - - Pr. Mt. § 8.
III. 8. - - - Mt. vi. 25.

I TIMOTHY.

I. 13. - - - D.IX. P.II. §13. D. X. P.V. §11.
— 15. - - - J. xv. 18.
II. 4. - - - D. X. P. V. § 8.
— 8. - - - D. VI. P. IV. § 4.
III. 11. - - - ——— P. I. § 2.
— 15. - - - J i. 17.
— 16. - - - D. IX. P. I. § 11. 13.
IV. 1. - - - D. VI. P. I. § 20.
— 3. - - - J. i. 17.
— 3. 10. 12. - - J. xx. 27.
—— 5. - - - Mr. vii. 2.
—— 6. - - - L. i. 3.
—— 10. - - - D. X. P. V. § 8.
— 12. - - - D. XI. P. II. § 6.
V. 8. - - - Mt. vi. 25.
— 13. - - - Mt. xii. 36.
— 16. - - - J. xx. 27.
VI. 1. - - - J. i. 16.
— 2. - - - J. xx. 27.

II TIMOTHY.

II. 7. - - - Mt. xxiv. 15. [3].
— 15. - - - J. i. 17.
III. 3. - - - D. VI. P. I. § 2.
—- 4. - - - L. i. 3. [3].
—- 6. - - - D. XII. P. I. § 19.
—- 8. - - - J. i. 17.
—- 10. - - - L. i. 3.
—- 15. - - - J. vii. 15.
IV. 2. - - - D. VI. P. V. § 10. L. i. 2.
—- 4. - - - J. i. 17.
—- 5. - - - D. VI. P. V. § 16. L. i. 1.
—- 7. - - - L. xii. 25.
—- 8. - - - Mt. xxvi. 45.
—- 17. - - - L. i. 1.

TITUS.

I. 8. - - - D. VI. P. IV. § 7. 17.
— 12. - - - Mt. xii. 36.
— 14. - - - J. i. 17.
II. 3. - - - D. VI. P. I. § 2.
— 11. - - - D. X. P. V. § 8. N. J. i. 17.
III. 10, 11. - - - D. IX. P. IV. § 11, 12.

HEBREWS.

I. 2. - - - J. i. 3.
— 3. - - - D. X. P. V. § 9.
— 4, &c. - - - D. VIII. P. III. § 10, 11.
— 7. - - - L. xix. 9.
III. 1. - - - J. x. 36.
IV. 2. - - - D. V. P. II. § 6.
— 9. - - - Mt. v. 5. 2.
V. 7. - - - L. vi. 12.
VI. 4. - - - J. iv. 10.
VII. 21. - - - D. VI. P. III. § 9.
— 26. - - - ——— P. IV. § 7.
IX. 9. - - - Mt. xiii. 3.
— 10. - - - D. II. P. II. § 7. Mr. vii. 4.
— 16, 17. - - - D. V. P. III. § 1.
X. 13. - - - Mt. xxvi. 25.
— 23. - - - J. ix. 7.
— 26. - - - J. i. 17.
— 36. - - - L. viii. 15.
— 37. - - - Mt. xi. 3.
— 38. - - - D. X. P. V. § 10.
XI. 11. - - - L. xii. 25.
— 13. - - - D. XII. P. I. § 14.
— 19. - - - Mt. xiii. 3.
— 37. - - - Mt. vii. 15. 2.
XII. 3. - - - L. viii. 15.
— 17. - - - D. VI. P. III. § 4.
— 25. - - - Mt. ii. 12.
XIII. 19. - - - Mt. xvii. 11.
— 24. - - - Mt. xv. 1.

JAMES.

I. 2. - - - Mr. x. 30.
— 8. - - - D. IV. § 19.
— 13. - - - Mt. iv. 7. 2.
— 20. - - - Mt. vi. 33.
II. 7. - - - D. IX. P. II. § 13.
— 19. - - - D. VII. P. I. § 21.
— 25. - - - D. VIII. P. III. § 14.
III. 1. - - - D. VII. P. I. § 12.
— 6. - - - L. xii. 25. D. VI. P. II. § 1.
— 15. - - - D. VI. P. I. § 21.
V. 12. - - - Mt. v. 37.
— 16. - - - L. vi. 12.
— 17. - - - D. IV. § 25.
— 19. - - - J. i. 17.

I PETER.

I. 2. 20. - - - D. IV. § 21.
— 22. - - - J. i. 17.
II. 6, 7. - - - D. XII. P. I. § 15.
— 24. - - - Mt. viii. 17.
III. 5, 6. - - - D. VII. P. I. § 6.
— 16. - - - Mt. v. 44. [2]. D. XI. P. II. § 6.
— 20, 21. - - - D. IX. P. I. § 8.
IV. 16. - - - ——— § 10.
— 24. - - - Mt. viii. 17.
V. 4. - - - D. VII. P. II. § 4.
— 8. - - - D. VI. P. I. § 3.
— 12. - - - J. i. 17.

II PETER.

II. 1. - - - D. IX. P. IV. § 10.
— 2. - - - J. i. 17.
— 4. - - - D. VI. P. II. § 19.
— 14. - - - Mr. vii. 22.
— 22. - - - J. ix. 7.

I JOHN.

I. 8. - - - D. X. P. V. § 12.
II. 1. - - - J. xiv. 16.
— 21. - - - J. i. 17.
III. 7. - - - D. XII. P. I. § 31.
— 9. - - - D. X. P. V. § 12.

II JOHN.

2. - - - J. i. 17.

III JOHN.

4. - - - J. xvi. 2.
8. - - - J. i. 7.
9. - - - D. VII. P. II. § 11.

JUDE.

9, 10. - - - D. IX. P. II. § 1.

REVELATION.

I. 5. - - - J. ix. 7.
— 10. - - - J. v. 2. [2].

I. 12. - - - J. i. 23.
— 13. - - - D. V. P. IV. § 13.
— 16. - - - J. vii. 24.
— 20. - - - D.IX.P.I. §7. D.VIII. P.III. §16.
II. 1. 8. 12. 18. - - D. VIII. P. III. § 16.
— 5. 16. 21, 22. - - D. VI. P. III. § 7.
— 7. - - - —— P. II. § 21.
— 7. 11. 17. 29. - - D. II. P. III § 5.
III. 1. 7. 14. - - D VIII. P. III. § 16.
— 4. - - - J. xvii. 11.
— 19 - - - D. VI. P. III. § 7.
IV. 8, &c. - - - —— P. IV. § 14.
V. 1. - - - D. II. P. I. § 3.
— 2. - - - D. VI. P. V. § 8.
— 8. - - - L. vi. 12.
— 13. - - - D. V. P. II. § 6.
VI. 6. - - - D. VIII. P. I. § 4, 5.
— 8. - - - D VI. P. II. § 13.
— 14. - - - D. II. P. I. § 3.
VIII. 3. - - - L. vi. 12.
—— 7. - - - Mt. vi. 30.
IX. 20. - - - D. VI. P. I. § 19.
X. 7. - - - —— P. V. § 14.
XII. 12. - - - J. i. 14. [2].
XIII. 6. - - - Ibid.
XIV. 6, 7. - - - D. V. P. II. § 17.
XV. 4. - - - D. VI. P. IV § 19.
XVI. 11. - - - D. IX. P II § 11.
XVII 7. - - - —— P.I § 7.11. D.X. P.III. § 9.
XIX. 17, 18. - - - L. xxii. 36.
XX. 2. - - - D. VI. P. I. § 3.
—— 14. - - - —— P. II. § 13.
XXI. 3. - - - L xvi. 9. [3]. J. i. 14. [2].

TOBIT.

II. 1. - - - D. VIII. P. III. § 3.

JUDITH.

IX. 11. - - - L. vi. 35.
XII. 15. - - - D. VIII. P. III. § 3.

WISDOM.

VII 3. - - - D. IV. § 25.
VIII. 19, 20. - - D. VI. P. II § 19.
XI. 14. - - - Mt. v. 6.
XVI. 13. - - - D. VI. P. II. § 17.
—— 25. - - - J. iv. 10.

ECCLESIASTICUS.

XIX. 26.	L. xvii. 21.
XXIV. 31.	Mr. vi. 40.
XXV. 26.	Mt. xxiv. 51.
XXVI. 7.	Mt. v. 28.
XXXII. 18.	L. xviii. 7.

I MACCABEES.

II. 21.	Mt. xvi. 22. [3].
— 29.	Mt. vi. 33.
IV. 48.	L. xvii. 21.
— 59.	J. x. 22.

II MACCABEES.

II. 29.	Mt. xxv. 34.
VII. 41.	J. xv. 18.

INDEX

OF GREEK WORDS AND PHRASES OCCASIONALLY ILLUSTRATED.

A

Αβυσσος - - - D. VI. P. II. § 14. L. viii. 31.
Αγαθος - - - Mt. xxv. 26.
Αγαλλιαω - - J. viii. 56.
Αγαπη μου - - J. xv. 10.
Αγγελος - - - D. VIII. P. III. § 8—16.
Αγιος - - - D. VI. P. IV.
—— *του Θεου* - - D. V. P. IV. § 14. L. iv. 34.
Αγιον πνευμα - - Mt. iii. 11. [2].
Αγιος κληθησεται - L. ii. 23. [2].
Αγναφος - - - Mt. ix. 16.
Αδης - - - D. VI. P. II.
Αδικια - - - J. vii. 18.
Αδικος - - - Mt. xxv. 26.
Αζυμα - - - D. VIII. P. II. § 3.
Αθετεω - - - Mr. vii. 9.
Αιρεσις - - - D. IX. P. IV.
Αιρω - - - J. x. 18. xv. 2.
Αιτεω - - - J. xvi. 30.
Αιχμαλωσια - - Mt. i. 11, 12.
Αιων - - - Mt. xii. 32.
εις τον Αιωνα - - J. viii. 51.
εκ του Αιωνος - - J. ix. 32.
Αιωνιος - - - L. xvi. 9. [3].
Ακακος - - - D. VI. P. IV. § 17.
Ακανθα, Ακανθος - Mt. xxvii. 29.
Ακοη - - - D. XII. P. I. § 15.
Ακουω - - - J. viii. 43. Mr. iv. 24.
Ακριβοω - - - Mt. ii. 7.
Ακρις - - - Mt. iii. 4. [2].
Αλετης ονος - - Mt. xviii. 6.
η Αληθεια - - J. i. 17.

Αληθης	J. v. 31.
Αληθινος	J. vii. 28. [2].
Αλλα	Mt. xx. 23.
Αλλογενης	L. xvii. 18.
Αμαρτια	J. viii. 46. [2].
Αμαρτωλος	Mt. xxvi. 45. [2]. D. XII. P. V. § 12.
Αμεταμελητος	D. VI. P. III. § 9.
Αμετανοητος	Ibid.
Αμην	Mt. v. 18.
Αμιαντος	D. VI. P. IV. § 17.
Αμφιβληστρον	Mt. iv. 18.
Αναβαινω	D. VI. P. II. § 20.
Αναβλεπω	Mr. viii. 24.
Αναγκαζω	L. xxiv. 29.
Αναθεμα	Mt. xv. 4.
Ανακειμαι	D. VIII. P. III. § 5.
Ανακλινω	Ibid.
Αναλαμβανω	D. VI. P. II. § 20.
Αναληψις	L. ix. 51.
Αναλογια της πιστεως	D. IV. § 14.
Αναπιπτω	D. VIII. P. III. § 3.
Αναπληροω	Mt. xiii. 14.
Αναστασις	D. VI. P. II. § 19. Mt. xxii. 23.
Αναστροφη	D. XI. P. II. § 6.
Ανατολη	Mt. ii. 2. L. i. 78.
Αναφερω	D. VI. P. II. § 20.
Ανδρες αδελφοι	D. XII. P. I. § 18.
Ανηθον	Mt. xxiii. 23.
Ανθιστημι	Mt. vi. 25.
Ανθυπατος	D. VIII. P. III. § 17.
Ανθρωποκτονος	J. viii. 44.
Ανθρωπος	D. XII. P. I. § 18.
Ανοητος	L. xxiv. 25.
Ανομος	Mt. xxv. 26.
Ανταλλαγμα	Mr. viii. 37. [2].
Αντειπειν	L. xxi. 15.
Αντι	J. i. 16.
Αντιδικος	D. VI. P. I. § 3, 4. 8.
Αντιλεγειν	L. xxi. 15.
Αντιπαρερχομαι	L. x. 32.
Αντλημα	J. iv. 11.
Ανωθεν	J. iii. 3.
Απαγχω	Mt. xxvii. 5.
Απαλλασσω	L. xii. 58.
Απειθων	D. XII. P. I. § 15.
Απελπιζω	L. vi. 95.
Απεχω	Mt. vi. 2.

Απεχει - - -	Mr. xiv. 41.
Απιστια - - -	Mr. ix. 24.
Απιστος - - -	L. xii. 46. J. xx. 27.
Απλους - - -	Mt. vi. 22.
Απο - - -	D. XI. P. I. § 15. Mt. xv. i. L. x. 30.
Απογραφεσθαι - -	L. ii. 1. [2].
Αποδημεω - -	Mt. xxi. 33.
Αποικια, Αποικεσια -	Mt. i. 11, 12.
Αποκαθιστημι - -	Mt. xvii. 11.
Αποκαλυψις - -	D. IX. P. I. § 3.
Αποκοπτω - -	Mt. xxiv. 51.
Αποκρυπτω - -	Mt. xi. 25. [2].
Απολυω - - -	Mt. i. 19. [3]. L. vi. 37.
Απομνημονευματα -	Pr. Mt. § 26.
Αποστερεω - -	Mr. x. 19.
Αποστελλω - -	J. x. 36.
Αποστολος - -	D. VIII. P. III. § 8. Mt. x. 2. J. x.36.
Αποσυναγωγος - -	J. ix. 22.
Αποτεμνω - -	Mt. xxiv. 51.
Αποτιμασθαι - -	L. ii. 1. [2].
Αποφερω - -	D. VI. P. II. § 20.
Απτεσθαι - -	J. xx. 17.
Αργος - - -	Mt. xii. 36.
Αργυριον - - -	D. VIII. P. I. § 4, 5. 10.
Αρειος παγος - -	D. VIII. P. III. § 18.
Αριστεω - - -	J. xxi. 12.
Αρνιον - - -	D. XII. P. I. § 19.
Αρπαζω - - -	D. V. P. II. § 21.
Αρτι - - -	Mt ix. 18.
Αρτος - - -	Mt iv. 3 [2]. xxvi. 26. L. xiv. 15.
Αρτοι της προθεσεως -	Mt. xii 4. [2].
Αρχη - - -	Mr. i. 1 D. III. § 9.
την Αρχην - -	J viii. 25.
Αρχιερευς - -	Mt. ii 4.
Αρχιτελωνης - -	L. xix 2.
Αρχιτρικλινος - -	D. VIII. P. III. § 6.
Αρχομαι - - -	Mr v. 17.
Αρχομενος - -	L. iii 23.
Αρχοντες - - -	L xiv. 1.
οἱ Αρχοντες αιτου -	D. VII. P. I. § 7.
Αρχων του κοσμου τουτου, και ἐ.	D. VI. P. I. § 8.
Ασκος - - -	Mt. ix. 17
Ασσαριον - -	D. VIII P. I. § 10.
Αστραπη - - -	L. xi 36.
Αυλη - - -	Mt xxvi 3. [2].
Αυταρκεια - -	D. IV § 18.
Αυτοκατακριτος - -	D. IX. P. IV. § 12.

Αφανιζω - - - D. XI. P. I. § 10.
Αφεδρων - - - Mr. vii. 19.
Αφιεναι το πνευμα - Mt. xxvii. 50.
Αφοριζω - - - L. vi. 22.
Αχρειος - - - D. XII. P. I. § 14.

B

Βαπτιζω, *Βαπτω* - - D. VIII. P. II. § 2. Mt. iii. 11. xx. 22.
Βαπτισμα, *Βαπτισμος* - - Mt. xx. 22. xxi. 25. Mr. vii. 3, 4. D. VIII. P. II. § 2.
Βαπτισιης - - Mt. iii. 1. [2].
Βαρος - - - D. X. P. II. § 4.
Βασανιζω - - Mt. viii. 6.
Βασανιστης - - Mt. xviii. 34.
Βασιλεια - - - D. V. P. I. L. xix. 12.
Βασιλευς - - - Mt. ii. 22.
Βασιλικος - - J. iv. 46.
Βαττολογεω - - Mt. vi. 7.
Βδελυγμα της ερημωσεως - Mt. xxiv. 15. [2].
Βεελζεβουλ - - Mt. ix. 25.
Βιβλιον· κ· ἐ· - - D. II. P. I. § 3. D. XII. P. I. § 19.
Βιβλος γενεσεως - - Mt. i. 1. D. XI. P. I. § 18, 19, 20.
Βλασφημια - - D. IX. P. II.
Βοηθεω - - - Mr. ix. 24.
Βολις - - - Mt. vii. 3.
Βουλευτης - - L. xxiii. 50.
Βουλευω - - - J. xii. 10.
Βους - - - J. ii. 14.
Βρωσις - - - Mt. vi. 19.
Βυθιζομαι - - L. v. 7.

Γ

Γαζοφυλακιον - - Mr. xii. 41.
Γαμεω - - - Mt. xxiv. 38.
Γαρ - - - D. X. P. V. § 11.
Γαστερες αργοι - - Mt. xii. 36.
Γεεννα - - - D. VI. P. II.
Γειτων - - - D. XII. P. I. § 11.
Γενεα - - - L. xvi. 8. [3].
Γενεαλογια - - D. XI. P. I. § 18.
Γενεσια - - - Mt. xiv. 6.
Γεννημα της αμπελου - Mt. xxvi. 29.
Γενομενος - - J. xiii. 2.
Γενος - - - Mr. ix. 29.
Γη - - - Mt. ii. 6. v. 5. [2]. x. 5. [2]. xxvii. 45.

Γηγενης	D. V. P. IV. § 13
Γινεσθαι	L. ii. 2. [3].
Γινωσκω	D. IV. § 21.
Γλωσσα	D. XII. P. IV. § 9
Γογγυσμος	J. vii. 12.
Γραμματα	—— 15.
Γραμματευς	Mt. ii. 4. [2]. D. XII. P. V. § 12.
Γραφη	J. vii. 15.
Γραφω	Mr. xii. 19.
Γυμνος	J. xxi. 7. [2].
Γυναικαριον	D. XII. P. I. § 19.
Γυνη	Mt. v. 28, J. ii. 4.

Δ

Δαιμονιον	D. VI. P. I. D. XII. P. I. § 19.
Δαιμονιζομενος	———— § 9, 10.
Δαιμονιωδης	———— § 21.
Δεησις	L. vi. 12.
Δειπνον	J. xxi. 12.
Δεισιδαιμων	D. VI. P. I. § 22.
Δενδρον	D. VII. P. I. § 7.
Δεσποτης	Mt. vi. 33.
Δευτεροπρωτος	L. vi. 1.
Δεω	Mt. xviii. 18.
Δηναριον	D. VIII. P. I. § 4. 6. 10.
Δια μεσου	L. xvii. 11.
Διαβαινω	D. VI. P. II. § 20.
Διαβολος	——— P. I.
Διαθηκη	D. V. P. III.
Διακομιδη	Mt. i 11, 12.
Διακονος	Mt. xx. 26, 27.
Διαλεγομαι	D. VI. P. V. § 11, 12.
Διανοιγον μητραν	L. ii. 23.
Διαπεραω	D. VI. P. II. § 20.
Διασπορα	J. vii. 35
Διδασκαλιαι δαιμονιων	D. VI. P. I. § 20.
Διδασκαλος	D. VII. P. II. Mt. xxiii. 8.
Διδασκω	D. VI. P. V. Mt. xxviii. 19. 20.
Διδαχη	Mt. vii. 28.
Διδραχμα	D. VIII. P. I. § 8.
Διδωμι σημειον	Mt. xxiv. 24.
Διετης	Mt. ii. 16. [2].
Δικαιος	Mt. i. 19. xxvii. 24, D. VI. P. IV. § 17.
Δικαιοσυνη	Mt. iii. 15. vi. 1. xxi. 32.
Δικαιοσυνη του Θεου	Mt. vi. 33.
Δικαιοω	L. vii. 29, [2]. 35.

Δικτυον - - - Mt. iv. 18.
Διχοτομεω, διχαζω - Mt. xxiv. 51.
Διψαω - - - Mt. v. 6.
Διψυχος - - - D. IV. § 19.
Διωκω - - - Mt. v. 11. 23.
Δοκεω - - - Mr. x. 42.
Δοκος - - - Mt. vii. 3.
Δοξα - - - D. X. P. II. § 4.
Δος δοξαν τῳ Θεῳ - J. ix. 24.
Δουλος - - - D. VII. P. I. Mt. xx. 26, 27.
ὁ Δρακων ὁ μεγας - D. VI. P. I. § 8.
Δρομος - - - L. xii. 25.
Δυναμαι - - - Mr. ii. 19. [2].
ου Δυναται ιδειν - - J. iii. 3. [2].
ἡ Δυναμις - - Mt. xxvi. 64.
Δωρεα - - - J. iv. 10.
Δωρον - - - Mr. vii. 11, 12.

E

Ἑβραιστι - - Pr. Mt. § 14—20.
Ἐγγαστριμυθος - - D. I. P. I. § 3.
Ἐγγιζειν - - - L. xviii. 35.
Ἐγκαινια - - J. x. 22.
Ἐθναρχης - - Mt. ii. 22.
Ἐθνος - - - Mt. xxi. 43. [2].
Ει - - - Mr. viii. 12. xv. 44. L. xii. 49.
Ειδος - - - J. v. 37, 38.
Ειδω - - - L. x. 32.
Ειρηνη - - - Mt. x. 12.
Ειρηνοποιος - - Mt. v. 9.
Εις - - - L. vii. 30.
Ἑις - - - Mr. xii. 29.
Εισφερω - - Mt. vi. 13.
Εκ - - - J. iii. 25.
Ἑκατονταρχος - - D. VIII. P. III. § 17.
Εκβαλλειν ονομα πονηρον - L. vi. 22. [2].
Εκγαμιζω - - Mt. xxiv. 38.
Εκδημεω - - D. VI. P. II. § 23.
Εκδικεω - - - L. xviii. 3.
Εκεινος - - - D. XII. P. I. § 31. L. ix. 34.
Εκκακειν - - - L. xviii. 1. [2].
Εκκλησια - - Mt. xviii. 17.
Εκκοπτω - - Mt. xxiv. 51.
Εκλειπω - - L. xvi. 9. [2].
Εκλεκτος - - D. XII. P. I. § 15. Mt. xxii. 14.
ὁ Εκλεκτος του Θεου - D. V. P. IV. § 14.
Εκλυω - - - Mt. ix. 36. [2]. xv. 32.
Εκπειραζω - - Mt. iv. 7. [2].

Εκπορευομενον εκ τυ στοματος Mt. iv. 4.
Ελεγχω – – – J. viii. 46.
Ελεεω – – – Mt. ix. 36.
Ελεημων – – D. I. P. IV. § 3.
Ελεος – – – Mt. ix 13. [2].
Ἕλληνις – – – Mr. vii. 29.
Ἑλληνισται – – D. I. P. I. § 6.
Εμβλεπω – – Mr. viii. 24.
Εμβριμαομαι – – Mr. ix. 25.
Εμπαιζω – – Mt. ii. 16.
Εμπροσθεν – – J. i. 15. [2].
Εν – – – D. XI. P. I. § 7, 8. L. i. 17. xvii. 21.
Εν Θεῳ – – – J. iii. 21.
Εν τῳ ονοματι Θεου – J. xvii. 11.
Εν ὑδατι – – Mt. iii. 11.
Εναρετος – – Mt. i. 19. xxv. 26.
Ενδημεω – – D. VI. P. II. § 23.
Ενδυμα – – – Mt. vii. 15. [2].
Ενοντα – – – L. xi. 41.
Ενοχος – – – Mt. v. 21, 22.
Ενταλμα – – Mt. xv. 9.
Ενταφιαζω – – J. xix. 40.
Εντολη – – – Mt. xv. 9.
Εντος – – – L. xvii. 21.
Ενωπιον Θεου – – L. i. 75.
Εξαιτεομαι – – L. xxii. 31.
Εξελθειν – – Mr. ix. 29.
Εξιστημι – – Mr. iii. 21. [4].
Εξοδος – – – Pr. Mr. § 2. L. ix. 31.
Εξομολογουμαι – – Mt. xi. 25.
Εξορκιζω – – Mt. xxvi. 63. Mr. v. 7.
Εξουσιαζω – – L. xxii. 25.
Ἑορτη – – – Mt. xxvi. 5.
Επαγγελια – – D. XII. P. I. § 14.
Επανω – – – L. iv. 39.
Επενδυτης – – J. xxi. 7.
Επηρεαζω – – Mt. v. 44.
Επι το αυτο – – Mt. xxii. 34.
Επι τῳ ονοματι – – Mt. xxiv. 5.
Επιβαλλω – – Mr. xiv. 72.
Επιβουλος – – D. VI. P. I. § 6.
Επιγειος – – ——— P. II. § 6, 7.
Επιγνους τῳ πνευματι αυτου Mr. ii. 8.
Επιζητεω – – L. iv. 42.
Επιθυμεω – – L. xvi. 21.
Επικαταρατος – – Mt. xv. 4.
Επιουσιος – – Mt. vi. 11.
Επισκεπτομαι – – Mt. xxv. 36. L. vii. 16.

Επιστρεφω – –	L. xxii. 32.
Επιτιμαω – –	Mt. xvi. 22. [2]. Mr. ix. 25.
Επιτροπος – –	D. VII. P. II. § 4.
Επιφωσκω – –	L. xxiii. 54.
Επουρανιος – –	D. VI. P. II. § 6, 7.
Επω – – –	J. xii. 49.
Επω παν πονηρον ῥημα –	Mt. v. 11.
Εργαζομαι – –	D. X. P. V. § 12.
Ερημος – – –	Mr. i. 3. D. XII. P. V. § 12.
Εριφιον – – –	D. XII. P. I. § 19.
Ερῥιμμενοι – –	Mt. ix. 36. [2].
ὁ Ερχομενος εν ονοματι κυριου	D. V. P. XII. § 12. P. IV. § 13. Mt. xi. 3.
Ερωταω – –	J. xvi. 30.
Εσκυλμενοι – –	Mt. ix. 36. [2].
Ἑστως – – –	L. v. 2.
Ἑταιρος – – –	D. XII. P. I. § 11.
Ευαγγελιον – –	D. V. P. II.
Ευαγγελιζειν – –	D. VI. P. V. § 14.
Ευαγγελιστης – –	——— § 16.
Ευδοκια – – –	L. ii. 14. [2].
Ευλαβης – –	D. VI. P. IV. § 3.
ὁ Ευλογητος – –	Mr. xiv. 61.
Ευλογεω – – –	Mt. xiv. 19.
Ευλογητος – –	Mt. v. 3.
Ευχαριστεω – –	Mt. xiv. 19.
Εφημερια – –	L. i. 5.
Ἑως θανατου – –	Mt. xxvi. 38.
—— *οὗ* – – –	Mt. i. 25. [2].
—— *τουτου* – –	L. xxii. 51.

Z

Ζηλωτης – – –	L. vi. 15.
Ζημιοω – – –	Mt. xvi. 26.
Ζιζανια – – –	Mt. xiii. 25.
Ζωγρεω – – –	L. v. 10.
Ζων ὑδωρ – –	J. iv. 10.

H

Ἡγεμονευω – –	L. ii. 4. [2].
Ἡγεμων – – –	D. VIII. P. III. § 17. Mt. ii. 6. [2].
Ἡλικια – – –	L. xii. 25.
Ἡρωδιανοι – –	Mt. xxii. 16.

Θ

Θαλασσα – –	Mt. iv. 15. [3].
Θαμβος – – –	L. v. 9.
Θαπτω – – –	J. xix. 40.

Θελω	Mt. xvi. 24. L. xiii. 31. J. vii. 17. xvii. 24.
Θεμελιος	Mt. xxv. 34.
Θεου οικος	Mt. xii. 4.
ὁ Θεος του αιωνος και ἐ.	D. VI. P. I. § 8.
Θεοφιλος	L. i. 3. [3].
Θησαυρος	Mt. vi. 19.
Θρηνος	Mt. xi. 17.
Θυγατριον	D. XII. P. I. § 19.

I

Ιδιος	D. VI. P. I. § 22. J. i. 11. v. 18.
Ἱερον	L. i. 9.
Ἱκανον εστι	L. xxii. 38.
Ἱλεως σοι	Mt. xvi. 22. [3].
Ἱματιον	D. VIII. P. III. § 2. J. xiii. 4.
Ἱνα	Mt. i. 22. [2]. xx. 31. Mr. v. 23. J. xvi. 2.
Ισος	Mr. xiv. 56.
ὁ Ἰσχυρος	L. xi. 21.
Ισως	L. xx. 13.
Ιουδαιστι	Pr. Mt. § 15.
Ἰχθυδιον	D. XII. P. I. § 19.

K

Καθαιρω	J xv. 2.
Καθαρισμος	L. ii. 22.
Καθαρος	D. VI. P. IV. § 3.
Καθαρος τη καρδια	Mt. v. 6.
Καθεξης	L. i. 3. [2].
Καθευδειν	D. VI. P. II. § 23.
Καθηγητης	Mt. xxiii. 8.
Καθημερινος	Mt. vi. 11.
Καθιζεσθαι	D. VIII. P. III. § 3.
Και	Mt. v. 19. [2].
ἡ Καινη διαθηκη	D. V. P. III.
Καιομενον	J. v. 35. [2].
Καιρος συκων	Mr. xi. 13.
Κακολογεω	Mt. xv. 4.
Κακοποιεω	Mr. iii. 4.
Κακος	Mt. xxi. 41. xxv. 26.
Καλεομαι μεγας	Mt. v. 19. [4].
Καμηλος	Mt. xix. 24.
Καρδια	D. IV. § 23, 24.
Κατα	Mt. Title. J. ii. 6. [2].
Καταβαινω	D. VI. P. II. § 20.
Καταβολη κοσμου	D. I. P. I. § 14. N. Mt. xxv. 34.
Καταγγελλω	D. VI. P. V. § 15.
Κατακλινομαι	D. VIII. P. III. § 3.

Κατακρινω	Mr. xvi. 16. [3]. J. viii. 11.
Καταλυμα	L. ii. 7. [2].
Καταλυω	Mt. v. 17.
Καταναθεματιζω	Mt. xv. 4.
Καταραομαι	Ibid.
Καταρτιζω	Mr. i. 19.
Κατασκηνωσις	Mt. viii. 20. [2].
Καταχθονιοι	D. VI. P. II. § 6.
Κατεχω	L. iv. 42. [2].
Κεντυριων	D. VIII. P. III. § 17.
Κερας	L. i. 69, 70, 71.
Κερατιον	L. xv. 16. [2].
Κεφαλαιοω	Mr. xii. 4.
Κερυκευω	D. VI. P. V. § 2.
Κηρυσσω κ.ε.	D. VI. P. V. § 2—10.
Κητος	Mt. xii. 40.
Κλεπτης	D. XI. P. II. § 6.
Κληρονομεω	Mt. v. 5.
Κλητος	Mt. xxii. 14.
Κλιβανος	Mt. vi. 30. [2].
Κλιναδιον	D. XII. P. I. § 19.
Κλισια	Mr. vi. 40.
Κοδραντης	D. VIII. P. I. § 10.
Κοιλια	Mr. vii. 19.
Κοιμαν	D. VI. P. II. § 13.
Κοινος	Mr. vii. 2.
Κολαζεσθαι	Mt. i. 19. [2].
Κολοβοω	Mt. xxiv. 22.
Κολπος του Αβρααμ	D. VI. P. II. § 19, 20.
Κολυμβηθρα	J. v. 2. [2].
Κορβαν	Mr. vii. 11, 12.
Κορβαναν	Mt. xxvii. 6.
Κοσμεω	Mt. xii. 44.
Κοσμος	D. III. § 8.
Κουστωδια	Mt. xxvii. 65.
Κοφινος	Mt. xvi. 9, 10.
Κρασπεδον	Mt. ix. 20.
Κρατιστος	L. i. 3.[4].
Κριμα	Mr. xii. 40.
Κρινω	Mr. xvi. 16. [3].
Κρισις	Mt. xxiii. [2]. J. v. 22.
ὁ εν τῳ Κρυπτῳ	Mt. vi. 8.
Κταομαι	L. xxi. 19.
Κτιζω	D. III. § 7.
Κυλλος	Mt. xv. 30, 31.
Κυναριον	D. XII. P. I. § 19.
Κυριακη	J. v. 2. [2].
Κυριος	D. VII. P. I. Mr. xii. 2. 9.

Κωμικος	D. IV. § 17.
	Λ
Λαλεω	D. VI. P. V. § 11, 12. L. i. 69, 70, 71. iv. 41. [2]. J. xii. 49.
Λαμβανω	Mt. viii. 17.
Λαμπρος	L. xxiii. 11.
Λατρεια	J. xvi. 2. [2].
Λατρευω	D. XI. P. I. § 12.
συ Λεγεις	Mt. xxvii. 11.
Λειτουργεω	D. XI. P. I. § 12.
Λεπτον	D. VIII. P. I. § 10.
Λευκος	L. xxiii. 11.
Ληστης	D. XI. P. II. § 6.
Λιθοβολεω	Mt. xxi. 35.
Λινον τυφομενον	Mt. xii. 20.
Λογος	Mt. iv. 4. L. i. 2. J. i. 1.
Λογον της χαριτος	L. iv. 22. [2].
Λοιπον	Mt. xxvi. 45.
Λουω	J. ix. 7.
Λυχνος	Mt. v. 15.
Λυω	—— 19. xviii. 18.
	Μ
Μαγδαληνη	Mt. xxvii. 56.
Μαγοι	Mt. ii. 1.
Μαθητευω	Mt. xxviii. 19, 20.
Μακαριος	Mt. v. 3. xiii. 16.
Μακραν	Mt. viii. 30.
Μακροθυμεω	L. xviii. 7.
Μακροθυμια	L. viii. 15.
Μαμωνα της αδικιας	L. xvi. 9.
Μανθανω	Mt. xi. 29.
Μαρτυρ	D. IX. P. IV. § 14.
Μαρτυρειν τινι	L. iv. 22.
Μεγιστανες	D. VII. P. I. § 7.
Μεθυω	J. ii. 10.
Μελλω	Mt. iii. 7. xvii. 22.
Μεριζω	Mt. xxiv. 51.
Μεριμναω	Mt. vi. 25.
Μετα	L. xi. 7.
Μεταμελομαι	D. VI. P. III.
Μετανοεω	Ibid.
Μετοικεσια, Μετοικια	Mt. i. 11, 12.
Μετρητης	J. ii. 6.
Μετρον πιστεως	D. IV. § 14.
Μηλωτη	Mt. vii. 15. [2].
Μηποτε	Mt. iv. 6.
Μητι, Μητιγε	Mt. xii. 22. J. iv. 29.

Μισεω – – –	L. xiv. 26.
Μνα – – –	D. VIII. P. I. § 10.
Μνημα – – –	D. VI. P. II. § 8.
Μνησθηναι ελεους –	L. i. 54, 55. [1. 2].
Μοδιος – – –	D. VIII. P. I. § 6. Mt. v. 15. [2].
Μοιχαλις – –	Mt. xii. 39.
Μοιχευω – –	Mt. v. 28.
Μυλη – – –	Mt. xviii. 6.
Μυλος ονικος – –	Ibid.
Μυρον – – –	Mt. xxvi. 7.
Μυστηριον – –	D. IX. P. I. Mt. xiii. 11.
Μωρε – – –	Pr. Mt. § 25.
Μωρολογια – –	Mt. xii. 36.
Μωρος – – –	Mt. xi. 25. [3].
	N
Ναζαρηνος } *Ναζωραιος* } – –	Mt. ii. 23.
Ναι, ναι – – –	Mt. v. 37.
Ναος – – –	L. i. 9.
Ναρδος πιστικη – –	Mr. xiv. 3. [2].
Νεανισκος – –	——— 51. [2].
Νεοτης – – –	Mt. xix. 20.
Νηπιον – – –	Mt. xi. 25. [3].
Νιπτω – – –	Mr. vii. 3, 4. J. ix. 7.
Νοεω – – –	Mt. xxiv. 15. [3].
Νομιζομαι – –	L. iii. 23. [2].
Νομικος – – –	D. XII. P. V. § 12.
Νομοδιδασκαλος – –	Ibid.
Νομος – – –	J. x. 34.
	Ξ
Ξυλον – – –	L. xxii. 52. [2]. Mt. vi. 30.
	O
Ὁ, ἡ, το – – –	D. X. P. V. § 2. Mt. i. 6. v. 15. [3].
Οικια – – –	D. XII. P. I. § 19.
Οικοδομεω – –	D. IV. § 18.
Οικονομος της αδικιας –	L. xvi. 8. [3].
ὁ Οικος του Θεου –	Mt. xii. 4.
Οικουμενη – –	L. ii. 1.
Οικτειρω – –	Mt. ix. 36.
Ολιγοπιστος – –	Mt. vi. 30. [3].
Ολιγοψυχος – –	Mt. v. 3. [3].
Ὁμοιοπαθης – –	D. IV. § 25.
Ὁμοιωμα – –	J. v. 37, 38.
Ὁμοφρονες – –	D. IX. P. III. § 4.
Οναριον – – –	D. XII. P. I. § 19.
Ονειδιζω – –	Mt. v. 11.

Ονικος – – –	Mt. xviii. 6.
Ονομα – – –	J. xvii. 11.
Ονος αλετης – –	Mt. xviii. 6.
Οπισω μου – –	Mt. xvi. 24. [2].
Ὅπως – – –	Mt. xii. 14.
Ὁριζω – – –	D. XI. P. I. § 7.
Ορεινη – – –	Mr. i. 3.
Ὁρκιζω – – –	Mt. xxvi. 63. Mr. v. 7.
Ορφανος – –	J. xiv. 11.
Ὅσιος κ. ἑ. – –	D. VI. P. IV.
Ὅτι – – –	D. X. P. III. § 4. P. V. § 11. L. i. 45. [2]. vii. 47.
Ου, ουκ – – –	Mt. v. 37.
Ὅυ ἑνεκεν – –	L. iv. 18.
Ου πας – – –	D. I. P. I. § 14. N. D. X. P. II. § 8, 9.
Ουαι – – –	L. vi. 24, 25, 26.
Ουδεν εστιν – –	Mt. xxiii. 16. 18.
Ουκετι – – –	Mr. xv. 5.
Ουρανοι – – –	D. V. P. I. § 4.
Ὅυτος – – –	D. III. § 23. Mt. xii. 24.
Οφελημα – –	Mt. vi. 12.
ὁ Οφις ὁ παλαιος –	D. VI. P. I. § 8.
Οψαριον – –	D. XII. P. I. § 19.
Οψε – – –	Mt. xxviii. 1.
Οψια – – –	Mt. xiv. 23.
Οψις – – –	J. vii. 24.

Π

Παγις – – –	Mt. v. 29.
Παθος – – –	D. IV. § 25.
Παιδιον κ. ἑ. – –	D. XII. P. I. § 11. 19. J. xiii. 33.
Παις – – –	Mt. ii. 16. [2].
ἡ Παλαια διαθηκη –	D. V. P. III.
Παλαι – – –	Mr. xv. 44.
Παλαιστη – –	L. xii. 25.
Παλιγγενεσια – –	D. XII. P. I. § 22. Mt. xix. 28.
Πανδοχειον – –	L. ii. 7. [2].
Πανουργος – –	D. IV. § 18.
Παντοτροφος – –	J. iv. 10.
Παρα – – –	J. xvii. 5.
οἱ Παρ᾽ αυτου – –	Mr. iii. 21. [2].
Παραβιαζομαι – –	L. xxiv. 29.
Παραβολη – –	Mt. xiii. 3.
Παραδειγματιζω –	Mt. i. 19. [2].
Παραδεισος – –	D. VI. P. II. § 21.
Παραδιδωμι – –	Mt. xxvi. 16.
Παραδοξα – –	L. v. 26.
Παραδοσις – –	Pr. Mt. § 8.

Παραδους	D. III. § 23. Mt. xxvi. 16.
Παρακλητος κ. ἑ.	J. xiv. 16.
Παρακολουθεω	L. i. 3.
Παρασκευη	J. xix. 16.
Παρατηρεω	J. xv. 20.
Παροιμια	J. xvi. 25.
Πασχα	D. VIII. P. II. § 3, 4. J. xix. 14.
Πας	D. X. P. V. § 8.
Πασχειν	D. IV. § 25.
Πατριᾳ	J. iv. 44.
Πεζη	Mt. xiv. 13.
Πειναω	Mt. v. 6.
Πειραζω	Mt. xvi. 1.
ὁ Πειραζων	D. VI. P. I. § 4.
Πεμπω	J. x. 36. Mt. vi. 13.
Πεπραγμενον αυτῳ	L. xxiii. 15.
Περαν	Mt. iv. 15.
Περατης	Pr. Mt. § 15.
Περιβαλλω	Mr. xiv. 51.
Περιοικος	D. XII. P. I. § 11.
Περισσευω	Mt. v. 20.
Περισσον	——— 47. [2].
Περιτομη	D. VIII. P. II. § 2.
Περιχωρος	Mr. i. 28.
Πετρα, Πετρος	J. i. 43.
τα Πετρωδη	Mt. xiii. 5.
Πηρα εις ὁδον	Mt. x. 10.
Πηχυς	L. xii. 25.
Πινακιδιον	D. XII. P. I. § 19.
Πιστευω	D. XII. P. I. § 15. J. ii. 22. [2].
της Πιστεως αναλογια	D. IV. § 14.
Πιστις	Mt. xxiii. 23. [2]. L. xviii. 8.
Πιστος	J. xx. 27.
Πλειον	Mt. xii. 41, 42.
Πλειονες	Mt. xxi. 36.
Πλεονεξια	Mr. vii. 22.
Πληροφορεω	L. i. 1.
Πληροω	Mt. i. 22. v. 17. [2].
Πλησιον	D. XII. P. I. § 11.
Πλοιαριον	D. XII. P. I. § 19.
Πλοιον	L. v. 2.
Πνευμα, Πνεω	D. VIII. P. III. § 10, 11. D. VI. P. II. § 23. Mr. ii. 8. J. iii. 8.
——— *ακαθαρτον, πονηρον*	D. VI. P. I. § 11.
Πνευματα	D. XII. P. IV. § 9.
εκ Πνευματος γεγεννημενος	J. iii. 8.
Ποιεω	D. III. § 7. D. X. P. V. § 12.
Ποιμαινω	J. xxi. 16.

Πολλοι - - -	D. X. P. V. § 8. J. xii. 42.
Πολυελεος - -	D. VI. P. IV. § 3.
Πονηρος - - -	Mt. v. 37. [2]. vi. 23. xxv. 26.
ὁ Πονηρος - -	D. VI. P. I. § 4. 8.
Πορνεια - - -	Mt. v. 32.
Πρασια - - -	Mr. vi. 40.
Πρασσω - - -	L. iii. 13.
Πραυθυμος - -	Mt. v. 3. [3].
Πρεσβυτεριον - -	L. xxii. 66.
Προ - - -	D. IV. § 20.
Προβατικη - -	J. v. 2. [2].
Προγινωσκω - -	D. IV. § 21.
Προδους - - -	D. III. § 23. Mt. xxvi. 16.
Προερεω - - -	D. IV. § 21.
Προοραομαι - -	—— § 20.
Προς - - -	L. xix. 9.
Προς ἡμας - -	Mr. vi. 3.
Προς το - - -	Mt. v. 28. [2].
Προσαιτων - -	L. xvi. 20.
Προσευχη - -	L. vi. 12.
Προσκυνεω - -	Mt. ii. 2. [2].
Προσλαβομενος - -	Mt. xvi. 22.
Προφασις - -	Mt. xxiii. 14.
Προφητης - -	Mt. vii. 15. Mr. vi. 15.
Προφητευω - -	Mt. xxvi. 68.
Πρωτοκλισια - -	D. VIII. P. III. § 6.
Πρωτος - - -	L. ii. 2. xiv. 1. J. xv. 18.
Πρωτοτοκος - -	Mt i. 25.
Πτερυγιον του ἱματιου -	Mt. ix. 20.
Πτυον - - -	Mt. iii. 12.
Πτωχος - - -	L. xvi. 20.
Πτωχοι τῳ πνευματι -	Mt. v. 3. [3].
Πυγμη - - -	Mr. vii. 3, 4.
Πυλαι ἅδου - -	D. VI. P. II. § 17.
Πωρωσις - -	D. IV. § 23. N.

P

῾Ραββι - - -	D. VII. P. II.
῾Ραβδος - - -	L. xxii. 52. [2].
῾Ραινω } *῾Ραντιζω* } - -	Mt. iii. 11.
῾Ρακα - - -	Pr. Mt. § 25.
῾Ρακος αγναφον - -	Mt. ix. 16.
῾Ρημα - - -	D. I. P. I. § 14. N. D. X. P. II. § 9. Mt. iv. 4.
—— *αργον* - -	Mt. xii. 36.
῾Ριπτω - - -	Mt. ix. 36. [2].
῾Ρυομαι - - -	Mt. vi. 13. [2].

Σ

Σαββας - - - Mt. xii. 5.
Σαββατον - - Ibid.
Σαγηνη - - - Mt. iv. 18.
Σαπρος - - - Mt. vii. 17.
Σαρξ - - - D. I. P. I. § 11. 14. N. N. J. viii. 15.
Σατανας - - - D. VI. P. I. § 3. 5. 8, 9.
Σεισμος - - - Mt. xxviii. 1.
Σεληνιαζομαι - - Mt. xvii. 15.
Σημειον - - - Mt. xxiv. 30.
Σικερα - - - L. i. 15.
Σκανδαλιζω - - Mt. v. 29. xiii. 21. 57. D. XI. P. I. § 22.
Σκανδαλον - - Mt. xiii. 41.
Σκηνη - - - Mt. xvii. 4. L. xvi. 9. [3].
Σκηνοπηγια - - D. VIII. P. II. § 3.
Σκηνοω - - - J. i. 14. [2].
Σκια θανατου - - Mt. iv. 16.
Σκληροκαρδια - - D. IV. § 22.
Σκληρυνω - - Ibid.
Σκολοψ - - - Mt. vii. 3.
Σκωλον - - - Mt. v. 29.
Σοφια λογου - - D. I. P. I. § 10.
Σοφος - - - Mt. xi. 25. [3].
Σπεκουλατωρ - - Mr. vi. 27.
Σπλαγχνιζομαι - - Mt. ix. 36.
Σπλην - - - D. IV. § 24.
Σπορος - - - Mt. xiii. 19.
Σπυρις - - - Mt. xvi. 9, 10.
Στατηρ - - - D. VIII. P. I. § 8.
Σταυρος - - Mt. x. 38. N.
Σταυροω - - Mr. xv. 25.
Στομαχος - - Mr. vii. 19.
Στρατηγοι του ἱερου - L. xxii. 52.
Στρεφω - - - Mt. xviii. 3.
Στρωννυμι - - Mr. xiv. 15.
Συ λεγεις - - Mt. xxvii. 11.
Συγχραομαι - - J. iv. 9.
Συκοφαντεω - - D. XII. P. I. § 16.
Συκοφαντης - - D. XI. P. I. § 18.
Συμβαλλω - - L. ii. 19.
Συμπληρουσθαι - - L. ix. 51.
Συμποσιον - - Mr. vi. 40.
Συνεδριον - - D. VIII. P. III. § 18.
Συνετος - - - Mt. xi. 25. [3].
Συνθηκη - - D. V. P. III. § 1.
Συνιημι - - - Mt. xiii. 19.
Συνοδια - - - L. ii. 44.
Συντελεια - - - Mt. xiii. 39.

Συντηρεω - - Mr. vi. 10.
Συντριβω - - Mr. xiv. 3. [2].
Σφραγιζω - - J. iii. 33.
Σχισμα - - - D. IX. P. III.
Σωτηρ - - - D. X. P. V. § 8.
Σωτηριον - - L. ii. 30, 31.

T

Ταλαντον - - D. VIII. P. I. § 8. 10.
Ταπεινος - - Mt. v. 3. [3]. D. II. P. II. § 2.
——— τη καρδια - Mt. xi. 29. [2].
Ταπεινοφρων - - Mt. v. 3. [3]. D. II. P. II. § 2.
Ταρταρος - - D. VI. P. II. § 19.
Ταφος - - - ——— § 8.
Τεκνιον - - - J. xiii. 33. D. XII. P. I. § 19.
Τεκνον - - - D. XII. P. I. § 11.
Τεκτων - - - Mt. xiii. 55.
Τελειν πολεις - - Mt. x. 23. [3].
Τελωνης - - - Mt. v. 46.
Τελωνιον - - Mt. ix. 9.
Τεταρταιος - - J. xi. 39.
Τετραρχης - - Mt. xiv. 1.
Τηρεω - - - J. xv. 20.
Τι - - - Mr. viii. 37.
Τιμαω - - - D. XII. P. I. § 15. J. xii. 26.
Τοκος - - - Mt. xxv. 27.
Τολμαω - - - Mr. xii. 34. J. xxi. 12. [3].
Τοπος ἁγιος - - Mt. xxiv. 15.
Τραγικος - - D. IV. § 17.
Τριστατης - - D. VII. P. I. § 7.
Τροφη - - - Mt. x. 10. [4].
Τροχος - - - L. xii. 25.
Τυφομενον λινον - - Mt. xii. 20.

Y

Ὑγιεια - - - D. X. P. II. § 4.
Ὑδωρ ζων - - J. iv. 10. [2].
ὁ Υἱος του ανθρωπου - D. V. P. IV. § 13.
—— της απολειας κ, ἑ. - D. VI. P. II. § 1.
—— Δαβιδ - - D. V. P. IV. § 14.
—— Θεου κ. ἑ. - - Mt. xiv. 33.
—— Διαβολου - - D. VI. P. I. § 3. P. II. § 1.
Υἱοι του νυμφωνος - Mr. ii. 19.
Ὑμνεω - - - Mt. xxvi. 30.
Ὑπαγω - - - J. xii. 11.
Ὑπαρχοντα - - L. xi. 21.
Ὑπηρετης - - Mt. xxvi. 58. [2]. L. i. 2. ii. 14, iv. 20.
Ὑποδηματα - - Mt. x. 10. [3].
Ὑποκατω της γης - D. VI. P. II. § 6.

Ὑποκριτης - -	Mt. xxiv. 51. [2]. D. III. § 24.
Ὑπομονη - -	L. viii. 15.
Ὑποστασις - -	D. X. P. V. § 9.
Ὑσσωπος - -	J. xix. 29.
Ὑψιστος - - -	L. ii. 14.
Ὑψοω - - -	J. iii. 14.
	Φ
Φαγειν αρτον - -	L. xiv. 15.
Φατνη - - -	L. ii. 7.
Φιλοθεος - - -	L. i. 3. [3].
Φιλοπρωτευων - -	D. VII. P. II. § 11.
Φιλος - - -	D. XII. P. I. § 11.
Φιλοσοφος - -	D. XI. P. I. § 18.
Φοινικη - - -	Pr. Mt. § 15.
Φρονειν - - - -	D. IX. P. III. § 4.
Φυλακτηριον - -	Mt. xxiii. 5.
Φωλεος - - -	Mt. viii. 20.
	X
Χαιρω - - -	Mt. xxviii. 9. [3].
Χαρα ἡ εμη - -	J. xvii. 13.
Χαραξ - - -	L. xix. 43.
Χαρις - - -	L. ii. 40. J. i. 17.
Χαριτοω - - -	L. i. 28.
Χειροτονεω - -	D. X. P. V. § 7.
Χιλιαρχος - -	D. VIII. P. III. § 17.
Χιτων - - -	——————— § 2.
Χοινιξ - - -	D. VIII. P. I. § 4.
Χολη - - -	Mt. xxvii. 34.
Χορτος - - -	Mt. vi. 30.
Χρεια - - -	L. viii. 15.
Χρηματιζω - -	Mt. ii. 12.
Χριστος - -	D. V. P. IV.
Χωρεω - - -	Mt. xix. 12.
Χωριον - - -	J. iv. 5.
	Ψ
Ψευδοπροφητης - -	Mt. vii. 15.
Ψευστης - -	D. III. § 24.
Ψυχη - - -	D. X. P. V. § 6. Mt. x. 39. xvi. 26. L. xiv. 26.
	Ω
Ὡρα - - -	Mt. viii. 13. xxiv. 36.
Ὡσει - - -	L. iii. 23.

END OF VOLUME FOURTH.

BS2555 .C187 1824 v.4
The four Gospels : translated from the
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00048 5641